1 2 3 4 5 6 7	M. ANDREW WOODMANSEE (CA SBN 201780 MAWoodmansee@mofo.com E. DALE BUXTON II (CA SBN 222580) DBuxton@mofo.com CHRISTIAN G. ANDREU-VON EUW (CA SBN 2 CAndreuvonEuw@mofo.com PAMELA MCELROY (CA SBN 26535) PMcelroy@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 12531 High Bluff Drive San Diego, California 92130-2040 Telephone: 858.720.5100 Facsimile: 858.720.5125				
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff, KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.				
9					
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
12	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
13		MACVAGEZ WOUDDD			
14	KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,	Case No. <b>'12CV0057 WQHRBB</b>			
15	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT			
16 17 18	v.  EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY,  Defendant.	DEMAND FOR J URY TRIAL			
19	Plaintiff Kyocera Communications Inc. ("K	CI") for its Complaint for Declaratory			
20   21	Plaintiff Kyocera Communications, Inc. ("KCI"), for its Complaint for Declaratory  Judgment against Defendant Eastman Kodak Company ("Kodak"), alleges as follows:				
22	NATURE OF THE ACTION				
23	1. KCI brings this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 and seeks a				
24	judicial declaration that U.S. Patent Nos. 5,493,335 ("the '335 patent") and 6,292,218 ("the '218				
25	patent") are invalid and not infringed by KCI's cellular phones which also incorporate digital				
26	camera technology. A copy of the '335 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A. A copy of the				
27	'218 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.				
28					
	1	CASE NOKYOCERA COMPLAINT			
	sd-575547				

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

## 

### 

# 

## 

### 

## 

### **PARTIES**

- 2. Plaintiff KCI is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 9520 Town Center Drive, San Diego, California 92121. KCI is the sales, marketing and service headquarters for Kyocera-branded products and accessories in the United States.
- 3. KCI is a wholly owned subsidiary of Kyocera Corporation ("KCJ"), a Japanese corporation with its principal office at 6 Takeda Tobadono-cho, Fushimi-ku, Kyoto-shi 612-8501, Japan. For over fifty years KCJ has been an innovator in ceramic components for electronics, as well as an innovator and a leader for over a decade in discovering, patenting, and implementing new technology for computer printers, multifunction products (MFPs) and other diverse technologies such as telecommunications equipment.
- 4. On information and belief, Defendant Kodak is a corporation existing under the laws of New Jersey with its principal place of business at 343 State Street, Rochester, New York 14650.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over KCI's claims under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq*. and under the Declaratory Judgment Act 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq*. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over KCI's claims pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201 and 2202.
- 6. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant Kodak. This Court has jurisdiction over Kodak at least because Kodak has continuous and systematic business contacts in California. On information and belief, Kodak researches and designs inkjet printers, MFPs, and printer supplies in the Southern District of California. Kodak's business activities in California also include marketing, selling, and providing consumer support for its products. On information and belief, Kodak's employees or agents also travel to and conduct Kodak's business in California.
  - 7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

### THE CONTROVERSY RELATING TO THE '335 AND '218 PATENTS

- 8. On information and belief, Kodak is the assignee, with purported enforcement rights, of the '335 and '218 patents.
- 9. On or about November 10, 1999, KCJ, KCI's parent company, received a letter from Kodak's licensing agent. That letter asserted that Kyocera products likely infringed various Kodak patents, including the '335 patent. A follow-up letter from Kodak's licensing agent to KCJ dated December 1, 1999, further emphasized KCJ's alleged "need for a license under the Kodak digital camera patent portfolio."
- 10. Between November 1999 and August 2002, KCJ and Kodak's licensing agent held multiple meetings to negotiate a patent license agreement. Kodak's licensing agent repeatedly asserted that various Kyocera products infringed both the '335 and '218 patents. For example, on September 13, 2001, Kodak's licensing agent provided KCJ infringement reports claiming that two of KCJ's products infringed the '335 patent. On January 15, 2002, Kodak's licensing agent identified specific claims of the '218 patent it believed certain Kyocera products infringed.
- 11. KCJ and Kodak entered into a Patent License Agreement on August 21, 2002 (the "PLA"). The PLA has an effective date of April 1, 2002, and is in force for 10 years. The PLA is applicable to KCJ and all of its subsidiaries, including KCI.
- 12. KCJ entered into the PLA to avoid litigation. The terms of the PLA specifically state that KCJ does not acknowledge the validity or admit that any of its products infringe any of the licensed Kodak patents.
- 13. Since the PLA has been in effect, Kodak and its licensing agent have continually asserted that the '335 and '218 patents are relevant to Kyocera products. Letters sent by Kodak's licensing agent on November 3, 2005, and January 13, 2006, for example, specifically state that the '218 patent is relevant to Kyocera mobile camera phones. At a February 2, 2006, meeting, Kodak's licensing agent again told KCJ that both the '335 and '218 patents were relevant to Kyocera products which incorporate digital camera technology.
  - 14. The PLA will expire on March 31, 2012.

- 15. Since 2010, KCJ and Kodak have engaged in discussions regarding the need for Kyocera to enter into a patent license agreement after expiration of the current PLA in March 2012. Those discussions have been unsuccessful.
- 16. Kodak has engaged in serial litigation against manufacturers and sellers of mobile phones who do not have current patent license agreements with Kodak. Kodak has, for example filed suits alleging infringement of the '335 or the '218 patents against at least Sony Corp., Apple Inc., Research in Motion Ltd., Samsung Ltd., LG Electronics; and Matsushita Electric Industrial Company.<sup>1</sup>
- 17. KCI markets and sells Kyocera products in the United States, including wireless phone devices incorporating digital camera technology.
- 18. KCI does not infringe, induce infringement of, or contribute to the infringement of any valid claim of the '335 or '218 patents because, when properly interpreted, such claims do not describe or encompass—either literally or by equivalents—any product made, used, offered for sale, or sold by KCI; nor any product that KCI induces others to make, use, or sell; nor any product to which KCI contributes to making, using, or selling.
- 19. Furthermore, the claims of each of the '335 and '218 patents are invalid for failing to comply with the requirements of the Patent Laws of the United States, particularly with regard to one or more of the requirements specified in Sections 101, 102, 103, and/or 112 of Title 35 of the United States Code.
- 20. An actual, substantial and continuing justiciable controversy exists between KCI and Kodak regarding the validity of the '335 and '218 patents and/or alleged infringement thereof by KCI. Kodak has asserted that Kyocera products using digital camera technology are covered by the '335 and '218 patents and require that Kyocera enter into a new license agreement as to those patents after the PLA expires on March 31, 2012. KCI, however, maintains that it can

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For Sony Corp., see Case No. 6:04-CV-06095 (W.D.N.Y.). For Apple Inc. and RIM, see Inv. No. 337-TA-703 (ITC). For Samsung Ltd. and LG Electronics, see Inv. No. 337-TA-663 (ITC). For Matsushita, see Case. No. 6:07-CV-00352 (E.D. Tex.).

1	market and sell Kyocera products incorporating digital camera technology in the United States				
2	after March 31, 2012 without entering into a new license to the '335 and '218 patents.				
3	CLAIM ONE				
4	(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '335 patent)				
5	21. KCI incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 20				
6	of its Complaint as if set forth fully herein.				
7	22. One or more claims of the '335 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the				
8	requirements of the Patent Laws of the United States, particularly with regard to one or more of				
9	the requirements specified in Sections 101, 102, 103, and/or 112 of Title 35 of the United States				
10	Code.				
11	23. KCI is entitled to a judicial determination that one or more claims of the '335				
12	patent are invalid for failing to comply with the requirements of the Patent Laws of the United				
13	States.				
14	CLAIM TWO				
15	(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '335 patent)				
16	24. KCI incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 23				
17	of its Complaint as if set forth fully herein.				
18	25. KCI has not infringed, induced infringement of, or contributed to the infringement				
19	of any valid claim of the '335 patent because when properly interpreted such claims do not				
20	describe or encompass, either literally or by equivalents, any product made, used, offered for sale,				
21	or sold by KCI; nor any product that KCI induces others to make, use, or sell; nor any product to				
22	which KCI contributes to making, using, or selling.				
23	26. KCI is entitled to a judicial determination that KCI has not infringed, induced				
24	infringement of, or contributed to infringement of, any valid claim of the '335 patent under any				
25	infringement theory.				
26					
27					
28					
	c CASE NO.				

# (Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '218 patent)

- KCI incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 26
- One or more claims of the '218 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the requirements of the Patent Laws of the United States, particularly with regard to one or more of the requirements specified in Sections 101, 102, 103, and/or 112 of Title 35 of the United States
- KCI is entitled to a judicial determination that one or more claims of the '218 patent are invalid for failing to comply with the requirements of the Patent Laws of the United

## (Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '218 patent)

- KCI incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 29
- KCI has not infringed, induced infringement of, or contributed to the infringement of any valid claim of the '218 patent because when properly interpreted such claims do not describe or encompass, either literally or by equivalents, any product made, used, offered for sale, or sold by KCI; nor any product that KCI induces others to make, use, or sell; nor any product to
- KCI is entitled to a judicial determination that KCI has not infringed, induced infringement of, or contributed to infringement of, any valid claim of the '218 patent under any

WHEREFORE, KCI respectfully prays for relief as follows:

Judgment that one or more claims of the '335 patent are invalid under one or more

1	(ii)	Judgment that no valid claim of the '.	335 patent is infringed by KCI under any		
2	infringement theory;				
3	(iii)	Judgment that one or more claims of	the '218 patent are invalid under one or more		
4	of the statutory provisions of Title 35 of the United States Code;				
5	(iv)	Judgment that no valid claim of the '.'	218 patent is infringed by KCI under any		
<ul><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>	infringemen	nt theory;			
8	(v)	An award to KCI of its costs;			
9	(vi)		ease and an award to KCI of its reasonable		
10					
11	attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and/or the inherent discretion of the Court; and  (vii) Such further relief as this Court may deem just, equitable and appropriate.				
12	(vii)	Such further relief as this Court may	deem just, equitable and appropriate.		
13	Dated: Janu	MORR MORR	RISON & FOERSTER LLP		
14					
15		Ву:	s/ M. Andrew Woodmansee M. ANDREW WOODMANSEE		
16			MAWoodmansee@mofo.com E. DALE BUXTON II		
17			DBuxton@mofo.com CHRISTIAN G. ANDREU-VON EUW		
18			CAndreuvonEuw@mofo.com PAMELA MCELROY		
19 20			PMcElroy@mofo.com		
20			Attorneys for Plaintiff KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.		
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

CASE NO. KYOCERA COMPLAINT

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

,	,			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KYOCERA COMM	IUNICATIONS, INC.	DEFENDANTS EASTMAN KO	DAK COMPANY	'12CV0057 WQHRBB
	f First Listed Plaintiff San Diego CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendan  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA  IN LAND CONDEMNAT  THE TRACT OF LAND II	ASES ONLY) ION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
M. Andrew Woodm E. Dale Buxton II (C Christian G. Andreu Pamela McElroy (C MORRISON & FOI 12531 High Bluff D San Diego, Californ	a-von Euw (CA SBN 265360) A SBN 26535) ERSTER LLP Drive	Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTI	ES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)
_	_	(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	_		or Principal Place $4$ $4$ $4$ In This State
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State		and Principal Place 5 5
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country		ess In Another State 6 6
	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)			
CONTRACT  110 Insurance	TORTS  PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY	RY 625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY  422 Appeal 28 USC 15	OTHER STATUTES  375 False Claims Act
□ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractice    Adv Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - □ 366 Personal Injury Product Liabilii □ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutica Personal Injury Product Liability   368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability   360 Other Personal   370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lendin □ 380 Other Personal   385 Property Dama □ 385 Property Dama	of Property 21 USC 881   690 Other	423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment   410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   893 Environmental Matters   895 Freedom of Information Act   896 Arbitration   896 Arbitration   896 Arbitration   898 Administrativa Procedura
□ 1 Original □ 2 Rem	Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other  448 Education   "X" in One Box Only) oved from  Court  Appellate Court	(Prisoner Petition)  465 Other Immigration Actions  Trans	ferred from er district	idistrict ation
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202				U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause:  Declaratory Judgment action regard	ding US patents US 5 493	335 and US 6 292 2	18
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION			only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND:

X Yes

UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

**COMPLAINT:** 

VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	<b>E(S)</b> (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD	)		<u>.</u>
January 9 2012		/s/ M. Andrew Woodmanse			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUDGE_	

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

#### Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction**. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties**. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- **V. Origin**. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

