

1 Matt Olavi, Esq. (Bar No. 265945)
 2 molavi@olavidunne.com
 3 Brian J. Dunne, Esq. (Bar No. 275689)
 4 bdunne@olavidunne.com

5 **OLAVI DUNNE LLP**
 6 800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 320
 7 Los Angeles, California 90017
 8 Telephone: (213) 516-7900
 9 Facsimile: (213) 516-7910

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC*

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13	ECLIPSE IP LLC, a Florida Limited Liability Company,) Case No.
14	Plaintiff,)
15	v.)
16	GOOGLE, INC., a Delaware Corporation; WAZE, INC., a Delaware Corporation,)
17	Defendants.)

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT
TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Plaintiff Eclipse IP LLC (“Eclipse”), by and through counsel, complains
2 against Google, Inc. (“Google”) and Waze, Inc. (“Waze”) (collectively
3 “Defendants”) as follows:

4 **NATURE OF LAWSUIT**

5 1. This is a suit for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of
6 the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code § 1 *et seq.* This Court has
7 exclusive jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Complaint under 28 U.S.C.
8 §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

9 **PARTIES AND PATENT**

10 2. Eclipse is a company organized under the laws of Florida and having a
11 principal place of business at 115 NW 17th St, Delray Beach, Florida 33444.

12 3. Eclipse owns all right, title, and interest in and has standing to sue for
13 infringement of United States Patent No. 8,068,037 ("the '037 patent"), entitled
14 "Advertisement systems and methods for notification systems" (Exhibit A) ("the
15 Eclipse Patent").

16 4. On information and belief, Google is a corporation existing under the
17 laws of Delaware.

18 5. On information and belief, Waze is a corporation existing under the
19 laws of Delaware.

20 6. On information and belief, Google does regular business in this Judicial
21 District, maintains at least one office in this Judicial District, and conduct leading to
22 Google’s acts of infringement has occurred in this Judicial District.

23 7. On information and belief, Waze does regular business in this Judicial
24 District and conduct leading to Waze’s acts of infringement has occurred in this
25 Judicial District.

26 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

27 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they have
28 engaged in continuous and systematic business in California; upon information and

1 belief, derive substantial revenues from commercial activities in California; and,
2 upon information and belief, are operating and/or supporting products or services
3 that fall within one or more claims of Eclipse's patent in this District.

4 9. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and
5 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) at least because the claim arises in this Judicial District, Google
6 and Waze may be found and transact business in this Judicial District, and injuries
7 suffered by Plaintiff took place in this Judicial District. Google and Waze are
8 subject to the general and specific personal jurisdiction of this Court at least because
9 of their contacts with the State of California.

10 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

11 10. Beginning in approximately 2007, with the advent of what is
12 considered the modern smartphone, consumers and businesses have enjoyed
13 unprecedented benefits from these devices and the services that they support.

14 11. For example, consumers can now use their smartphones to search the
15 Internet, purchase products online, video conference with one another, and even
16 navigate from one place to another with turn-by-turn directions.

17 12. The growth of the mobile consumer, armed with a smartphone or tablet,
18 has spawned a panoply of new industries. One such industry is the mobile and
19 location-based advertising industry.

20 **Location-Based Retail Advertising**

21 13. Retail advertising is the process of calling the public's attention to a
22 business, usually for the purpose of selling products or services, through the use of
23 various forms of media. Advertising provides a direct line of communication to a
24 business' existing and prospective customers.

25 14. In the past, advertisers have used traditional forms of media, such as
26 print, radio, and television, to deliver these advertisements.

27 ///

28 ///

1 15. However, the advent of the smartphone and their now nearly-
2 ubiquitous use among consumers in the United States have created an entirely new
3 way to deliver advertisements based on the consumers' location.

4 16. Location-based advertising is a new form of advertising that integrates
5 advertising with location-based services. Using the user's location or location
6 history, location-based advertising allows businesses to target advertisements to
7 users who are nearby. Advertisements sent to nearby users, such as someone
8 driving past the retail establishment, are far more valuable to retailers than
9 advertisements sent to someone else miles away.

10 17. For example, according to a recent study by Verve Mobile – a niche
11 mobile advertising network – advertising campaigns that used location-based data
12 performed twice as well as those that did not.

13 18. The effectiveness of mobile advertising has led to increased spending
14 on mobile advertising in lieu of spending in other mediums. For example, according
15 to Gartner, Inc. – a leading information technology research and advisory company
16 – worldwide mobile advertising revenue in 2013 is expected to reach \$11.4 Billion
17 and is expected to grow rapidly in the coming years. *See, e.g.,*
18 <http://www.gartner.com/newsroom/id/2306215>.

19 19. Google has itself recognized the importance and value of using
20 location-based information to deliver advertisements to consumers and has at least
21 one patent itself related to mobile, location based advertising. *See, e.g.,* U.S. Patent
22 No. 7,668,832, entitled “Determining and/or using location information in an ad
23 system.”

24 **DEFENDANTS' ACTS OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

25 20. Eclipse reiterates and reincorporates the allegations set forth in
26 paragraphs 1 through 19 above as if fully set forth herein.

27 ///

28 ///

1 turn navigation; determine that a notification should be made based upon the user's
2 location; provide a notification when the user is near his destination; and provide
3 advertisements as part of or accompanying the notification communication in
4 exchange for a fee.

5 45. Additionally and/or in the alternative, on information and belief,
6 Defendants have actively induced and continue to actively induce and/or have
7 contributed to and continue to contribute to the infringement of one or more claims
8 of the '037 patent, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or (c), by, among other
9 things, actively, knowingly, and intentionally encouraging, aiding, and/or abetting
10 others to make, use, offer for sale, and/or sell portions of a computer-based
11 notification system that infringes one or more claims of the '037 patent, with the
12 specific intent to encourage infringement and with the knowledge that the making,
13 using, offering to sell, and/or selling of such a system would constitute
14 infringement.

15 46. On information and belief, Defendants have had knowledge of the '037
16 patent at least as early as December 27, 2013, the day that each received a courtesy
17 copy of the Complaint, which set forth factual allegations of both Google's and
18 Waze's infringement. Additionally, at least as early as December 27, 2013,
19 Defendants knew or should have known that their continued offering, use,
20 deployment, and/or operation of the at least one computer-based notification system
21 and their continued support of others, if those parties perform any limitations of one
22 or more of the claims of the '037 patent, would induce direct infringement of the
23 '037 patent, as they had actual knowledge of the patent and factual allegations of
24 their infringement thereof.

25 47. On information and belief, Defendants have not changed or modified
26 their infringing behavior since December 27, 2013.

27 48. Defendants' aforesaid infringing activity has directly and proximately
28 caused damage to Plaintiff Eclipse, including loss of profits from sales and/or

1 licensing revenues it would have made but for the infringements. Unless enjoined,
2 the aforesaid infringing activity will continue and cause irreparable injury to Eclipse
3 for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Eclipse asks this Court to enter judgment against
6 Defendants and against each of Defendants’ respective subsidiaries, affiliates,
7 agents, servants, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with
8 them, granting the following relief:

- 9 1. A judgment that Defendants have infringed the Eclipse Patent;
- 10 2. A permanent injunction against Defendants, their respective officers,
11 agents, servants, employees, attorneys, parent and subsidiary corporations, assigns
12 and successors in interest, and those persons in active concert or participation with
13 them, enjoining them from direct and indirect infringement of the Eclipse Patent;
- 14 3. An award of damages adequate to compensate Eclipse for the
15 infringement that has occurred, together with prejudgment interest from the date
16 infringement of the Eclipse Patent began;
- 17 4. A reasonable royalty for Defendants’ use of Eclipse’s patented
18 technology, as alleged herein;
- 19 5. An award to Eclipse of all remedies available under 35 U.S.C. §§ 284
20 and 285; and,
- 21 6. Such other and further relief as this Court or a jury may deem proper
22 and just.

23

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: December 27, 2013

OLAVI DUNNE LLP

By: /s/ Matt Olavi

Matt Olavi
Brian J. Dunne
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Eclipse IP LLC

JURY DEMAND

Eclipse demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38.

DATED: December 27, 2013

OLAVI DUNNE LLP

By: /s/ Matt Olavi

Matt Olavi
Brian J. Dunne
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Eclipse IP LLC