

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

**PARALLEL NETWORKS, LLC,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**ADIDAS AMERICA, INC., et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**6:10-CV-00491**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**SUNGLASS HUT'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM TO PARALLEL  
NETWORKS' ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Defendant Sunglass Hut Trading, LLC, ("Sunglass Hut") files this Answer and Counterclaim to Plaintiff Parallel Networks, LLC's ("Parallel Networks") Original Complaint for Patent Infringement ("Complaint"). Sunglass Hut denies the allegations and characterizations in Parallel Networks' Complaint unless expressly admitted in the following paragraphs:

1. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations of Paragraph 1 and therefore denies the same.

2–57. Paragraphs 2 through 57 do not require a response by Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraphs 2 through 57 are deemed to require a response, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

58. Sunglass Hut admits that it has a place of business in Mason, Ohio but denies that it is a corporation.

59–61. Paragraphs 59 through 61 do not require a response by Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraphs 59 through 61 are deemed to require a response, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

62. Sunglass Hut admits that this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code and that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a). Sunglass Hut admits that it is subject to this Court's specific and general jurisdiction but denies it is due to any alleged infringement. Sunglass Hut further lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations against the other defendants and therefore denies the same. Except as expressly admitted herein, Sunglass Hut denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 62.

63. Sunglass Hut admits that venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c) and 1400(b), but denies that venue is convenient. Sunglass Hut admits that it is subject to personal jurisdiction in the Eastern District of Texas but denies it is due to any alleged infringement. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations against the other defendants and therefore denies the same. Except as expressly admitted herein, Sunglass Hut denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 63.

## **COUNT I**

### **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,446,111**

64. Sunglass Hut denies that the '111 Patent was duly and legally issued. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny all other allegations of Paragraph 64 and therefore denies the same.

65. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations of Paragraph 65 and therefore denies the same.

66. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations of Paragraph 66 and therefore denies the same.

67–286. Paragraphs 67 through 286 do not require a response by Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraphs 67 through 286 are deemed to require a response, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

287. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 287.

288. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 288.

289. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 289.

290. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 290.

291–302. Paragraphs 291 through 302 do not require a response by Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraphs 291 through 302 are deemed to require a response, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same.

303. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 303 directed at Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraph 303 is deemed to require a response with respect to the other Defendants, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same. Except as expressly admitted herein, Sunglass Hut denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 303.

304. Sunglass Hut denies the allegations of Paragraph 304 directed at Sunglass Hut. To the extent that Paragraph 304 is deemed to require a response with respect to the other Defendants, Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations and therefore denies the same. Except as expressly admitted herein, Sunglass Hut denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 304.

**COUNT II**  
**WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT**

305. Sunglass Hut denies that it received pre-suit notice of the '111 Patent. Sunglass Hut denies that it has infringed or is infringing the '111 Patent. Sunglass Hut further

denies that it has willfully infringed or is willfully infringing the '111 Patent. Sunglass Hut lacks knowledge sufficient to confirm or deny the allegations against the other defendants and therefore denies the same. Except as expressly admitted herein, Sunglass Hut denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 305.

306. Sunglass Hut requests that the Court deny all relief to Parallel Networks, including that requested by Parallel Networks in its Prayer for Relief.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Sunglass Hut's Affirmative Defenses are listed below. Sunglass Hut reserves the right to amend its Answer to add additional Affirmative Defenses, including instances of inequitable conduct, consistent with the facts discovered in the case.

### **FIRST DEFENSE**

307. Sunglass Hut does not infringe and has not infringed any claim of the '111 Patent under any theory (including directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement)).

### **SECOND DEFENSE**

308. The '111 Patent is invalid because the alleged invention fails to satisfy the conditions for patentability specified in 35 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*, including §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

### **THIRD DEFENSE**

309. To the extent that Parallel Networks, and alleged predecessors-in-interest to the '111 Patent, failed to properly mark any of their relevant products as required by 35 U.S.C. § 287 or otherwise give proper notice that Sunglass Hut's actions allegedly infringed the '111

Patent, Sunglass Hut is not liable to Parallel Networks for the acts alleged to have been performed before it received actual notice that it was allegedly infringing the '111 Patent.

#### **FOURTH DEFENSE**

310. To the extent that Parallel Networks asserts that Sunglass Hut indirectly infringes, either by contributory infringement or inducement of infringement, Sunglass Hut is not liable to Parallel Networks for the acts alleged to have been performed before Sunglass Hut knew that its actions would cause indirect infringement.

#### **FIFTH DEFENSE**

311. Parallel Networks' attempted enforcement of the '111 Patent against Sunglass Hut is barred by laches and estoppel.

#### **SIXTH DEFENSE**

312. Parallel Networks' claims directed to indirect infringement, either by contributory infringement or inducement of infringement, and willful infringement fail to state a claim for which relief may be granted.

#### **COUNTERCLAIMS**

##### **The Parties**

313. Counterclaim Plaintiff Sunglass Hut Trading, LLC, ("Sunglass Hut") is a limited liability company with its principal place of business located in Mason, Ohio.

314. On information and belief based solely on Paragraph 1 of the Complaint as pled by Parallel Networks, Parallel Networks is a Texas Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located in Tyler, Texas.

## **Jurisdiction**

315. This counterclaim arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code. The jurisdiction of this Court is proper under at least 35 U.S.C. § 271 *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367, and 2201 *et seq.*

316. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to at least 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400. Venue is further proper in the Tyler Division.

## **Count I**

### **Declaratory Relief Regarding Non-infringement**

317. Based on Parallel Networks' filing of this action and Sunglass Hut's First Defense, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties as to whether Sunglass Hut infringes the '111 Patent.

318. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, Sunglass Hut requests a declaration by the Court that it does not infringe any claim of the '111 Patent under any theory (including directly (whether individually or jointly) or indirectly (whether contributorily or by inducement)).

## **Count II**

### **Declaratory Relief Regarding Invalidity**

319. Based on Parallel Networks' filing of this action and Sunglass Hut's Second Defense, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties as to the validity of the claims of the '111 Patent.

320. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and 35 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*, Sunglass Hut requests a declaration by the Court that the claims of the '111 Patent are invalid.

### **Count III**

#### **Declaratory Relief Regarding Unenforceability**

321. Based on Parallel Networks' filing of this action and Sunglass Hut's Third, Fourth, and Fifth Defenses, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties as to the enforceability of the '111 Patent.

322. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, Sunglass Hut requests a declaration by the Court that the claims of the '111 Patent are unenforceable.

#### **PRAYER**

Sunglass Hut respectfully requests a judgment against Parallel Networks as follows:

- A. A declaration that the '111 Patent is unenforceable;
- B. A declaration that the asserted claims of the '111 Patent are invalid;
- C. A declaration that Sunglass Hut does not infringe, under any theory, any valid claim of the '111 Patent that may be enforceable;
- D. A declaration that Parallel Networks take nothing by its Complaint;
- E. Judgment against Parallel Networks and in favor of Sunglass Hut;
- F. Dismissal of the Complaint with prejudice;
- G. An award to Sunglass Hut of its costs and attorneys' fees incurred in this action;  
and
- H. Further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

Sunglass Hut hereby demands trial by jury on all issues.

Dated: November 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

By: /s/ Neil J. McNabney

Thomas M. Melsheimer

Texas Bar No. 13922550

txm@fr.com

Neil J. McNabney

Texas Bar No. 24002583

njm@fr.com

Britnee M. Reamy

Texas Bar No. 24053439

bmr@fr.com

David B. Conrad

Texas Bar No. 24049042

dbc@fr.com

1717 Main Street, Suite 5000

Dallas, Texas 75201

(214) 747-5070 Telephone

(214) 747-2091 Facsimile

**Counsel for Defendant**

**SUNGLASS HUT TRADING, LLC**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served on November 22, 2010, to all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

*/s/ Neil J. McNabney*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Neil J. McNabney