

1 BRANDON C. FERNALD (SBN 222429)
2 brandon@fernaldlawgroup.com
3 **FERNALD LAW GROUP APC**
4 510 West Sixth Street, Suite 700
5 Los Angeles, California 90014
6 Telephone: 323.410.0320
7 Facsimile: 323.410.0330

8 LOUIS M. HEIDELBERGER (Pro Hac Vice To Be Filed)
9 Louis.heidelberger@gmail.com
10 **THE LAW OFFICES OF LOUIS M. HEIDELBERGER,**
11 **ESQ. LLC.**
12 1229 Laurel Oak Lane
13 York, Pennsylvania 17403
14 Telephone: 215.284.8910
15 Facsimile: 267.388.3996

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff
17 TECHNICAL LED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, LLC
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 TECHNICAL LED
21 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY,
22 LLC, a Delaware limited liability
23 company,

24 Plaintiff,

25 v.

26 BVGA MIPOW (USA) CO., LTD, a
27 California limited liability company,

28 Defendant.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT (U.S. PATENT
NO. RE41,685)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

29 This is an action for patent infringement in which Technical LED Intellectual
30 Property, LLC (“Technical LED” or “Plaintiff”) makes the following allegations
31 against BVGA Mipow (USA) Co., Ltd (“Mipow” or “Defendant”):

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

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Technical LED is a Delaware limited liability company, with its principal place of business located at 251 Little Falls Dr., Wilmington, DE 19808.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Mipow has a principal place of business at 675 Sycamore Drive, Malpitas, CA 95034.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(c) and 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendant has transacted business in this district, and has committed and/or induced acts of patent infringement in this district.

5. On information and belief, Defendant is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal jurisdiction pursuant to due process and/or California’s Long Arm Statue, due at least to its substantial business in this forum, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; (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 California and in this Judicial District; and having a regular and established place of business in this Judicial District.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

Pursuant to N.D. Civil Local Rule 3-2(c), this is an intellectual property action subject to district-wide assignment.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Infringement of U.S. Patent No. RE41,685

6. Plaintiff is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. RE41,685 (“the ’685 Patent”) titled “Light Source with Non-White and Phosphor-

1 Based White LED Devices and LCD Assembly.” The ’685 Patent reissued on
2 September 14, 2010. A true and correct copy of the ’685 Patent is attached as **Exhibit**
3 **A**.

4 7. Upon information and belief, Defendant directly or through
5 intermediaries has been and is now infringing the ’685 Patent in the State of
6 California, in this judicial district, and elsewhere in the United States, by, making,
7 using, providing, supplying, distributing, selling, and/or offering for sale products
8 (including at least its website at www.mipow.com) further including its playbulb
9 smart lights and similar type assemblies, comprising a light source that infringes one
10 or more claims of the ’685 Patent and particularly, e.g., claims 10 through 14 of the
11 ’685 Patent. The ’685 Patent reads on Mipow’s, playbulb smart light as set forth in
12 the exemplary claims chart for the E26 Bluetooth smart light, attached as **Exhibit B**
13 and the BTL 400-BK playbulb attached as **Exhibit C**.

14 8. Upon information and belief and in view of the foregoing, Defendant
15 has been and is continuing to directly infringe, literally infringe, and/or infringe the
16 ’685 Patent under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant is thus liable for
17 infringement of the ’685 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271.

18 9. As a result of Defendant’s infringement of the ’685 Patent, Plaintiff has
19 suffered monetary damages and is entitled to a money judgment in an amount
20 adequate to compensate for Defendant’s infringement, but in no event less than a
21 reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by Defendant, together with
22 interest and costs as fixed by the court, and Plaintiff will continue to suffer damages
23 in the future unless Defendant’s infringing activities are enjoined by this Court.
24 Unless a permanent injunction is issued enjoining Defendant and its agents, servants,
25 employees, representatives, affiliates, and all others acting on in active concert
26 therewith from infringing the ’685 Patent, Plaintiff will be greatly and irreparably
27 harmed.
28

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

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter:

1. A judgment in favor of Plaintiff that Defendant has willfully infringed and is willfully infringing the ‘685 Patent, and has induced infringement and is inducing infringement of the ‘685 Patent;


2. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, agents servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in active concert therewith from infringement, inducing the infringement of, or contributing to the infringement of ‘685 Patent, or such other equitable relief the Court determines is just and proper;

3. A judgment and order requiring Defendant pay to Plaintiff its damages, attorneys fees, costs, expenses, and prejudgment and post-judgment interest for Defendant’s infringement and willful infringement of the ‘685 Patent as provided under 35 U.S.C. § 284, and an accounting of ongoing post-judgment infringement; and

4. Any and all other relief, at law or equity, to which Plaintiff may show itself to be entitled.

DATED: January 22, 2019

FERNALD LAW GROUP APC



By. _____
Brandon C. Fernald

Attorneys for Plaintiff
TECHNICAL LED INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY, LLC

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Technical LED, pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 38-1, hereby requests a trial by jury of any issues so triable by right.

DATED: January 22, 2019

FERNALD LAW GROUP APC

By. 

Brandon C. Fernald

Attorneys for Plaintiff
TECHNICAL LED INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY, LLC