

KAYE SCHOLER LLP

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

Michael J. Malecek (State Bar No. 171034)
Email address: michael.malecek@kayescholer.com
Kenneth Maikish (State Bar No. 267265)
Email address: kenneth.maikish@kayescholer.com
KAYE SCHOLER LLP
Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 400
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, California 94306
Telephone: (650) 319-4500
Facsimile: (650) 319-4700

Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ICONFIND, INC.,) Case No. 2:11-CV-00319 GEB JFM
)
Plaintiff,) **DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S**
) **FIRST AMENDED ANSWER TO**
) **PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR**
v.) **PATENT INFRINGEMENT AND**
) **COUNTERCLAIMS**
GOOGLE INC.,)
)
Defendant.)
)
)
)

1 Defendant and counterclaimant Google Inc. (“Google”), by and through the undersigned
2 counsel, answers the Complaint of Patent Infringement of Plaintiff (the “Complaint”) and
3 counterclaim defendant IconFind, Inc. (“IconFind”) as follows:

4 1. Google admits that Plaintiff’s Complaint purports to state an action for patent
5 infringement and that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over patent law claims. Google
6 denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 1.

7 2. Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
8 truth of the allegations of paragraph 2, and therefore denies them.

9 3. Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
10 truth of the allegations of paragraph 3, and therefore denies them.

11 4. Google admits that Google Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of
12 business in Mountain View, California. Google admits that it owns and operates
13 www.google.com, knol.google.com, books.google.com, and picasa.google.com.

14 5. Solely for the purposes of this action, Google does not contest personal jurisdiction
15 in this District. Google denies that it has committed any acts of infringement within this or any
16 other district and denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 5.

17 6. Solely for the purposes of this action, Google admits that venue is proper in the
18 Eastern District of California.

19 7. Denied.

20 8. Google is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
21 truth of the allegations of paragraph 8, and therefore denies them.

22 9. Google admits that it received a letter from Plaintiff’s counsel, dated January 19,
23 2009 regarding IconFind and related to the U.S. Patent No. 7,181,459 (“the ’459 patent” or the
24 Patent-in-suit”). Google also admits that reference to the ’459 patent appears on the face of U.S.
25 Patent Nos. 7,664,734; 7,693,825; and 7,788,274. Google denies that it has committed any acts of
26 infringement of the ’459 patent and denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 9.

Fifth Defense

18. Any and all products or actions accused of infringement have substantial uses that do not infringe and do not induce or contribute to the alleged infringement of the '459 patent.

COUNTERCLAIMS

Pursuant to Rule 13 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Google for its Counterclaims against IconFind, alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Google is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, California 94043.

2. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff IconFind, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California with a principal place of business at 1660 Drew Circle #27, Davis, California 95618.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and by virtue of IconFind's admissions in the Complaint that venue is proper in this District.

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over IconFind.

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these Counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

COUNT ONE - Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '459 Patent

6. Google restates and incorporates by reference its allegations in paragraphs 1-5 of its Answer and Counterclaims.

7. An actual case or controversy exists between Google and IconFind as to whether the '459 patent is infringed by Google.

1 8. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Google may ascertain its
2 rights regarding the '459 patent.

3 9. Google has not infringed and does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and
4 enforceable claim of the '459 patent.

5 **COUNT TWO - Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '459 Patent**

6 10. Google restates and incorporates by reference its allegations in paragraphs 1-5 of its
7 Counterclaims.

8 11. The '459 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it fails to claim patentable
9 subject matter insofar as it seeks to claim an abstract idea.

10 12. The '459 patent is invalid because it fails to meet the “conditions for patentability”
11 of 35 USC §§ 102, 103, and/or 112 because the alleged invention thereof lacks utility; is taught by,
12 suggested by, and/or obvious in view of, the prior art; and/or is unsupported by the written
13 description of the patented invention.

14 **EXCEPTIONAL CASE**

15 13. On information and belief, this is an exceptional case entitling Google to an award
16 of its attorneys' fees incurred in connection with defending and prosecuting this action pursuant to
17 35 U.S.C. § 285, as a result of, *inter alia*, IconFind's assertion of the Patent-in-suit against Google
18 with the knowledge that Google does not infringe any valid or enforceable claim of the Patent-in-
19 suit and/or that the Patent-in-suit is invalid and/or unenforceable.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Google prays for judgment as follows:

- 22 a. A judgment dismissing IconFind's Complaint against Google with prejudice;
- 23 b. A judgment declaring that Google has not infringed, contributed to the infringement
24 of, or induced others to infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and
25 enforceable claim of the '459 patent;
- 26 c. A judgment declaring that the '459 patent is invalid and unenforceable;

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

- d. A judgment declaring that Google has not willfully infringed and is not willfully infringing any valid and/or enforceable claim of the '459 patent.
- e. A judgment declaring that this case is exceptional and an award to Google of its reasonable costs and expenses of litigation, including attorneys' fees and expert witness fees;
- f. A judgment declaring, limiting or barring IconFind's ability to enforce the '459 patent in equity;
- g. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

In accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Google demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: April 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
KAYE SCHOLER LLP

By: /s/ Michael J. Malecek
Michael J. Malecek
Attorney for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.