

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

EOLAS TECHNOLOGIES INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., ET AL,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 6:09-cv-446

Hon. Leonard E. Davis

JURY

**ANSWER OF DEFENDANT YOUTUBE, LLC  
TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Defendant YouTube, LLC ("YouTube") answers the First Amended Complaint of Eolas Technologies Incorporated ("Eolas") as follows:

**I. PARTIES**

1. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 1, and therefore denies them.

2. The allegations of paragraph 2 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 2, and therefore denies them.

3. The allegations of paragraph 3 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 3, and therefore denies them.

4. The allegations of paragraph 4 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 4, and therefore denies them.

5. The allegations of paragraph 5 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 5, and therefore denies them.

6. The allegations of paragraph 6 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 6, and therefore denies them.

7. The allegations of paragraph 7 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 7, and therefore denies them.

8. The allegations of paragraph 8 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 8, and therefore denies them.

9. The allegations of paragraph 9 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 9, and therefore denies them.

10. The allegations of paragraph 10 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 10, and therefore denies them.

11. The allegations of paragraph 11 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube admits that Google Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, California 94043. YouTube admits that Google Inc. may be served with process through its registered agent Corporation Service Company d/b/a CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Company in Austin, Texas. YouTube denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 11.

12. The allegations of paragraph 12 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 12, and therefore denies them.

13. The allegations of paragraph 13 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 13, and therefore denies them.

14. The allegations of paragraph 14 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 14, and therefore denies them.

15. The allegations of paragraph 15 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 15, and therefore denies them.

16. The allegations of paragraph 16 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 16, and therefore denies them.

17. The allegations of paragraph 17 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 17, and therefore denies them.

18. The allegations of paragraph 18 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 18, and therefore denies them.

19. The allegations of paragraph 19 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 19, and therefore denies them.

20. The allegations of paragraph 20 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 20, and therefore denies them.

21. The allegations of paragraph 21 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 21, and therefore denies them.

22. The allegations of paragraph 22 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 22, and therefore denies them.

23. YouTube admits that YouTube, LLC is a Delaware corporation with a principal place of business at 1000 Cherry Ave, San Bruno, CA 94066. YouTube admits that it may be

served with process through its registered agent Corporation Service Company d/b/a CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Company in Austin, Texas. YouTube denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 23.

## **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

24. Paragraph 24 of the Complaint does not state any allegations, and therefore YouTube believes that no response is required. However, YouTube expressly incorporates the contents of the preceding paragraphs of this Answer and includes them by reference as if fully set forth herein.

25. YouTube admits that this action invokes the United States patent laws, and that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over patent law claims. YouTube denies any remaining allegations of paragraph 25.

26. YouTube does not contest personal jurisdiction in this District solely for the purpose of this action. YouTube denies that it has committed acts of infringement within the Eastern District of Texas, or any other District. To the extent the remaining allegations of paragraph 26 are directed at YouTube, they are denied. To the extent the allegations of paragraph 26 are directed to other entities, YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 26, and therefore denies them.

27. YouTube admits that venue is proper in the Eastern District of Texas for purposes of this particular action but not convenient or in the interests of justice under 28 U.S.C. 1404(a). To the extent the remaining allegations of paragraph 27 are directed at YouTube, they are denied. To the extent the allegations of paragraph 27 are directed to other entities, YouTube is

without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 27, and therefore denies them.

### **III. ALLEGATION OF PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

28. Paragraph 28 of the Complaint does not state any allegations, and therefore YouTube believes that no response is required. However, YouTube expressly incorporates the contents of the preceding paragraphs of this Answer and includes them by reference as if fully set forth herein.

29. YouTube admits that U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906 (“the ‘906 patent”) is entitled “Distributed hypermedia method for automatically invoking external application providing interaction and display of embedded objects within a hypermedia document” and bears an issuance date of November 17, 1998, and also admits that U.S. Patent No. 7,599,985 (“the ‘985 patent”) is entitled “Distributed hypermedia method and system for automatically invoking external application providing interaction and display of embedded objects within a hypermedia document” and bears an issuance date of October 6, 2009 (collectively “the asserted patents”). YouTube admits that the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an Ex Parte Reexamination Certificate of the ‘906 patent on two separate occasions. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of paragraph 29 and therefore denies them.

30. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 30, and therefore denies them.

31. The allegations of paragraph 31 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 31, and therefore denies them.

32. The allegations of paragraph 32 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 32, and therefore denies them.

33. The allegations of paragraph 33 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 33, and therefore denies them.

34. The allegations of paragraph 34 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 34, and therefore denies them.

35. The allegations of paragraph 35 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 35, and therefore denies them.

36. The allegations of paragraph 36 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 36, and therefore denies them.

37. The allegations of paragraph 37 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 37, and therefore denies them.

38. The allegations of paragraph 38 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 38, and therefore denies them.

39. The allegations of paragraph 39 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 39, and therefore denies them.

40. The allegations of paragraph 40 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 40, and therefore denies them.

41. The allegations of paragraph 41 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 41, and therefore denies them.

42. The allegations of paragraph 42 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 42, and therefore denies them.

43. The allegations of paragraph 43 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 43, and therefore denies them.

44. The allegations of paragraph 44 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 44, and therefore denies them.

45. The allegations of paragraph 45 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 45, and therefore denies them.



46. The allegations of paragraph 46 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 46, and therefore denies them.

47. The allegations of paragraph 47 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 47, and therefore denies them.

48. The allegations of paragraph 48 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 48, and therefore denies them.

49. The allegations of paragraph 49 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 49, and therefore denies them.

50. The allegations of paragraph 50 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 50, and therefore denies them.

51. The allegations of paragraph 51 are not directed to YouTube, and therefore no answer is required. YouTube is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of paragraph 51, and therefore denies them.

52. Denied.

53. YouTube denies the allegations in paragraph 53 of the Complaint as they relate to YouTube. YouTube does not have sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 53 and, therefore, denies these allegations.

54. YouTube denies the allegations in paragraph 54 of the Complaint as they relate to YouTube. YouTube does not have sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 54 and, therefore, denies these allegations.

55. YouTube denies the allegations in paragraph 55 of the Complaint as they relate to YouTube. YouTube does not have sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 55 and, therefore, denies these allegations.

56. YouTube denies the allegations in paragraph 56 of the Complaint as they relate to YouTube. YouTube does not have sufficient information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 56 and, therefore, denies these allegations.

#### **IV. RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

These paragraphs set forth the statement of relief requested by Eolas to which no response is required. YouTube denies that Eolas is entitled to any of the requested relief and deny any allegations.

#### **V. RESPONSE TO DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Eolas' demand that all issues be determined by a jury trial does not state any allegation, and YouTube is not required to respond. To the extent that any allegations are included in the demand, YouTube denies these allegations.

#### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Subject to the responses above, YouTube alleges and assert the following defenses in response to the allegations, undertaking the burden of proof only as to those defenses deemed affirmative defenses by law, regardless of how such defenses are denominated herein. In addition to the affirmative defenses described below, subject to its responses above, YouTube

specifically reserves all rights to allege additional affirmative defenses that become known through the course of discovery.

#### **First Defense**

1. YouTube does not infringe and has not infringed (not directly, contributorily, or by inducement) any claim of the asserted patents.

#### **Second Defense**

2. The claims of the asserted patents are invalid for failure to satisfy one or more of the requirements of Sections 100 *et seq.*, 101, 102, 103, and 112 of Title 35 of the United States Code.

#### **Third Defense**

3. The claims of the asserted patents are unenforceable, in whole or in part, by the doctrines of laches, waiver and/or estoppel, including prosecution history estoppel.

#### **Fourth Defense**

4. The claims of the asserted patents are unenforceable due to unclean hands.

#### **Fifth Defense**

5. 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 asserted claims of the asserted patents.

#### **Sixth Defense**

6. The owner of the asserted patents has dedicated to the public all methods, apparatus, and products disclosed in the asserted patents, but not literally claimed therein, and is estopped from claiming infringement by any such public domain methods, apparatus, or products.

**Seventh Defense**

7. Eolas' claim for damages, if any, against YouTube for alleged infringement of the asserted patents are limited by 35 U.S.C. §§ 286, 287 and 288.

**Eighth Defense**

8. Eolas is not entitled to injunctive relief as it, at a minimum, has not suffered any alleged immediate or irreparable injury, and Eolas has an adequate remedy at law.

**Ninth Defense**

9. This case is exceptional against Eolas under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

**Tenth Defense**

10. To the extent that the alleged invention has been used or manufactured by or for the United States, the claims for relief are barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1498.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, YouTube prays for judgment as follows:

- a. A judgment dismissing Eolas' Complaint against YouTube with prejudice;
- b. A declaration that YouTube has not infringed, contributed to the infringement of, or induced others to infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claims of the asserted patents;
- c. A declaration that the asserted patents are invalid;
- d. A declaration that Eolas' claims are barred by the doctrines of laches, equitable estoppel, and/or waiver.
- e. A declaration that the asserted patents are unenforceable due to unclean hands.

- f. A declaration that this case is exceptional and an award to YouTube of its reasonable costs and expenses of litigation, including attorneys' fees and expert witness fees;
- g. A judgment limiting or barring Eolas' ability to enforce the asserted patents in equity;
- h. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: June 7, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Michael E. Jones  
Michael E. Jones  
State Bar No. 10929400  
Allen F. Gardner  
State Bar No. 24043679  
POTTER MINTON  
A Professional Corporation  
110 N. College, Suite 500 (75702)  
P.O. Box 359  
Tyler, Texas 75710  
(903) 597-8311  
(903) 593-0846 (Facsimile)  
[mikejones@potterminton.com](mailto:mikejones@potterminton.com)  
[allengardner@potterminton.com](mailto:allengardner@potterminton.com)

Scott T. Weingaertner  
[sweingaertner@kslaw.com](mailto:sweingaertner@kslaw.com)  
Robert F. Perry  
[rperry@kslaw.com](mailto:rperry@kslaw.com)  
Christopher C. Carnaval  
[ccarnaval@kslaw.com](mailto:ccarnaval@kslaw.com)  
Mark H. Francis  
[mfrancis@kslaw.com](mailto:mfrancis@kslaw.com)  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036-4003  
Telephone: (212) 556-2100  
Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this **ANSWER OF DEFENDANT YOUTUBE, LLC TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT** via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) on this the 7th day of June 2010. Any other counsel of record will be served via First Class U.S. Mail on this same date.

*/s/ Michael E. Jones*

Michael E. Jones