

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

STEELHEAD LICENSING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**ACER INC., and
ACER AMERICA CORPORATION,**

Defendants.

C.A. No. _____

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Steelhead Licensing LLC (“Steelhead”), by and through its undersigned counsel, for its Complaint against Acer, Inc. (“Acer”) and Acer America Corporation (“Acer America”) (collectively, “Defendants”), alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code (“U.S.C.”) to prevent and enjoin Defendants from infringing and profiting, in an illegal and unauthorized manner and without authorization and/or consent from Steelhead, from U.S. Patent No. 5,491,834 (the “834 Patent”), attached hereto as Exhibit A) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §271, and to recover damages, attorneys’ fees, and costs.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Steelhead is a Delaware limited liability with its principal place of business at 222 Delaware Avenue, PO Box 25130, Wilmington, DE 19899.

3. Acer is a company from Taiwan with its principal place of business at 8F, 88, Section 1, Xintai 5th Road, Xizhi, New Taipei City 221 F5 10516815.

4. Acer America is a California corporation with its principal place of business at 333 W San Carlos St., Suite 1500, San Jose, CA 95110. Acer America can be served with process through its agent CT Corporation System, 818 W. Seventh St., Los Angeles, CA 90017.

5. Acer America is wholly owned by Acer.

6. Defendants are in the business of making, using, selling, offering for sale and/or importing laptop computers.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338(a) because the action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §1 et seq.

8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants by virtue of their systematic and continuous contacts with this jurisdiction, as well as because of the injury to Steelhead and the cause of action Steelhead has raised, as alleged herein.

9. Defendants are subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or the Delaware Long-Arm Statute, *Del Code. Ann. Tit. 3, §3104*, due to at least their substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringement alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Delaware.

10. Defendants have conducted and do conduct business within the state of Delaware, directly or through intermediaries, resellers, agents, or offer for sale, sell, and/or advertise products in Delaware that infringe the '834 Patent.

11. In addition to Defendants' continuously and systematically conducting business in Delaware, the causes of action against Defendants are connected (but not limited) to Defendants' purposeful acts committed in the state of Delaware, including Defendants' making, using, importing, offering for sale, or selling products which include features that fall within the scope of at least one claim of the '834 Patent.

12. Venue lies in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§1391 and 1400(b) because, among other reasons, Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this District, and have committed and continue to commit acts of patent infringement in this District. For example, Defendants have used, sold, offered for sale, and/or imported infringing products in this District.

JOINDER

13. Defendants are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. §299(a)(1) because a right to relief is asserted against the parties jointly, severally, and in the alternative with respect to the same transactions, occurrences, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, and/or selling the same accused products. Specifically, as alleged in detail below, Defendants are alleged to infringe the '834 Patent with respect to the same portable devices including, but not limited to, Acer® Aspire AO722.

14. Defendants are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. §299(a)(2). Questions of fact will arise that are common to both defendants, including for example, whether Defendants' products have features that meet the features of one or more claims of the '834 Patent, and what reasonable royalty will be adequate to compensate the owner of the '834 Patent for its infringement.

15. Defendant Acer America is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Acer. By virtue of Acer's ownership of Acer America, both offer the same portable devices that infringe on the '834 Patent.

16. Defendants use, make, sell, offer for sale and/or import portable devices that, when used, infringe on the '834 Patent.

17. At least one right to relief is asserted against these parties jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling of the same accused product and/or process.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18. On February 13, 1996, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") duly and legally issued the '834 Patent, entitled "Mobile Radio Handover Initiation Determination" after a full and fair examination. Steelhead is presently the owner of the patent and possesses all right, title and interest in and to the '834 Patent. Steelhead owns all rights of recovery under the '834 Patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement. The '834 Patent is valid and enforceable.

19. The '834 Patent contains eight independent claims and twelve dependent claims. Defendants commercialize, *inter alia*, methods that perform all the steps recited in one or more claim of the '834 Patent. Defendants make, use, import, and sell or offer for sale products, including portable devices, which encompass one or more of the features recited and which perform all the steps comprised in the patented claims.

20. The invention claimed in the '834 Patent includes a process for determining the manner in which handover is performed in a mobile radio network including a plurality of cells,

where each cell is associated with a base station supporting communication with a mobile device.

21. The patented process includes the steps of monitoring the quality of a signal as a function of time respectively transmitted between candidate base stations and the mobile unit. The process further includes producing an indication of either the rise or fall of the signal's quality as a function of time. Handover from a serving base station supporting communication with the mobile unit to another base station is initiated based on the rise or fall in the signal's quality.

22. Portable computing devices (such as notebooks, laptops, tablets, and similar devices) may connect to the Internet using a wired or wireless interface. Examples of such wireless interfaces include the so-called WiFi or 3G connections. While the WiFi relies on a static point of access, a 3G connection allows users to move (or "roam") along with their computer devices without losing connectivity. In these instances, communication is handed over from one communication cell to another, much like mobile phones relying on the same technology.

23. Manufacturers of portable devices rely on the patented process to handle service associated with such portable devices. Specifically, Defendants rely on the patented process to determine the manner in which communication service associated with a portable device is to be handed over from one cell to another.

24. Defendants commercialize portable devices which support the Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (hereinafter, "UMTS") standard. These products will be hereinafter identified as Defendants' UMTS Products.

25. UMTS is a third-generation (3G) of mobile phone technology for radio systems. It is an integrated solution for mobile voice and data capabilities with wide area coverage. It allows users to send and/or receive text, voice, video, and multimedia files at theoretical transfer rates of up to 2Mbps.

26. In order to maintain a stable Internet connection for mobile computing devices, such as Defendants' UMTS Products, it is necessary to maintain an established user connection even if the user is changing locations, or the radio access environment surrounding the user is changing, while a connection is still active. "Handover" refers to the transfer of user connection from one access point to another. For Defendants' UMTS Products, Defendants rely on the patented process to determine mobile device communication conditions for initiating a handover from one cell to another.

DEFENDANTS' INFRINGEMENT

27. Defendants practice patented mobile telecommunications methods with respect to certain portable devices commercialized in this judicial district. Specifically, Defendants practice a method that determines the manner in which handover of service is performed among cells in a mobile network with respect to certain portable devices, such as laptop computers.

28. Defendants' UMTS Products include, but are not limited to, the Acer® Aspire AO722.

29. Each Defendants' UMTS Product forms a mobile terminal that can be used on a mobile radio network such as that provided by a telecommunications company or a carrier. This network is formed by a plurality of cells.

30. Each of Defendants' UMTS Products include a processor and a memory device with instructions stored therein. Upon execution, these instructions perform a handover

determination method in which each of Defendants' UMTS Products searches for a better cell pursuant to the cell reselection process stated in the UMTS standard.

31. Each of Defendants' UMTS Products comply with the UMTS standard. As such, when communicating, it maintains an active list of base stations with which the Defendants' UMTS Products have sufficient signal strength to communicate. The active list of base stations is used by each of Defendants' UMTS Products themselves to initiate cell reselection.

32. Specifically, when Defendants' UMTS Products are used in a mobile radio network, they receive signals from base stations within range. In accordance with the UMTS standard, Defendants' UMTS Products periodically measure the signals received from base stations in the vicinity for handover determination purposes. Then, each of Defendants' UMTS Products generate an indication of the quality of the received signal. Each device produces a ranking of available base stations based on a set of measured criteria, including but not limited to the quality of each received signal.

33. Pursuant to the UMTS standard, Defendants' UMTS Products initiate the switch to a new cell (the handover of communication) based on how the new cell is ranked and only if the new cell is ranked higher than the cell currently handling the communication for a given period of time. If the ranking of a potential new cell falls, such drop is an indication of a fall in the measured criteria (e.g., quality).

34. Under the UMTS standard, when Defendants' UMTS Products identify a better candidate cell, it sends a message to the base station currently servicing the communication. Such message indicates that a switch should occur, such that communication is handed over to the new base station. The message sent by each of Defendants' UMTS Products initiate the handover of service from a current cell to a new, better cell.

35. The patented method recited in one or more claims of the '834 Patent is performed when a cell reselection is made by any of Defendants' UMTS Products when they are using either the UMTS standard to communicate.

COUNT 1:
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF THE '834 PATENT

36. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-35.

37. Taken together, either partially or entirely, the features included in the Defendants' UMTS Products including, but not limited to, Acer® Aspire AO722, perform the process recited in one or more claims of the '834 Patent.

38. Defendants directly infringe one or more claims of the '834 Patent by using Defendants' UMTS Products, which perform the process defined by one or more claims of the '834 Patent. For example, without limitation, Defendants directly infringe at least claim 8 of the '834 Patent by using Defendants' UMTS Products, including use by Defendants' employees and agents, use during product development and testing processes, and use when servicing and/or repairing laptops on behalf of customers.

39. By engaging in the conduct described herein, Defendants have injured Steelhead and are thus liable for infringement of the '834 Patent, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §271.

40. Defendants have committed these acts of infringement without license or authorization.

41. To the extent that facts learned in discovery show that Defendants' infringement of the '834 Patent is or has been willful, Steelhead reserves the right to request such a finding at the time of trial.

42. As a result of Defendants' infringement of the '834 Patent, Steelhead has suffered monetary damages and is entitled to a monetary judgment in an amount adequate to compensate for Defendants' past infringement, together with interests and costs.

43. Steelhead will continue to suffer damages in the future unless Defendants' infringing activities are enjoined by this Court. As such, Steelhead is entitled to compensation for any continuing or future infringement up until the date that Defendants are finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement.

44. Steelhead has also suffered and will continue to suffer severe and irreparable harm unless this Court issues a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, branches, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them from directly or indirectly infringing the '834 Patent.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

45. Steelhead demands a trial by jury of any and all causes of action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Steelhead respectfully prays for the following relief:

1. That Defendants be adjudged to have infringed the '834 Patent;
2. That Defendants, their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, affiliates, divisions, branches, parents, and those persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be preliminarily and permanently restrained and enjoined from directly and/or indirectly infringing the '834 Patent;
3. An award of damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §284 sufficient to compensate Steelhead for Defendants' past infringement and any continuing and/or future infringement up

until the date that Defendants are finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;

4. An assessment of pre-judgment and post-judgment interests and costs against Defendants, together with an award of such interests and costs, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §284;

5. That Defendants be directed to pay enhanced damages, including Steelhead's attorneys' fees incurred in connection with this lawsuit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285; and

6. That Steelhead have such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: January 11, 2013

OF COUNSEL:

Eugenio Torres-Oyola
FERRAIUOLI LLC
221 Plaza 5th Floor
221 Ponce de León Ave.
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00917
(787) 766-7000
etorres@ferraiuoli.com

BAYARD, P.A.

/s/ Stephen B. Brauerman

Richard D. Kirk (#0922)
Stephen B. Brauerman (#4952)
Vanessa R. Tiradentes (#5398)
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
P.O. Box 25130
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 655-5000
rkirk@bayardlaw.com
sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com
vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Steelhead Licensing LLC