

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

-----X		
CRFD RESEARCH, INC.,	:	C.A. No. _____
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC.	:	
	:	
Defendant	:	
	:	
-----X		

Complaint for Patent Infringement

Plaintiff, CRFD Research, Inc. (“CRFD”) alleges the following for its complaint of patent infringement against Cox Communications, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Cox Communications”).

Nature of the Action

This is an action for patent infringement of United States Patent No. 7,191,233 (the “’233 Patent”) under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, and seeking damages and injunctive and other relief under 35 U.S.C. § 281, *et seq.*

The Parties

1. Plaintiff CRFD is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 2331 Mill Road, Suite 100, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Cox Communications, Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1400 Lake Hearn Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30319. Cox Communications has appointed Corporation Service Company, 2711 Centerville Road, Suite 400, Wilmington,

Delaware 19808 as its agent for service of process.

Jurisdiction and Venue

3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because the action concerns the infringement of United States patents.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because, among other reasons, Defendant has transacted business in the State of Delaware.

6. Upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant at least because it is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and has purposely availed itself of the privileges and benefits of the laws of Delaware.

The Patent-In-Suit

7. CRFD is the owner by assignment of the '233 Patent, entitled "System for Automated, Mid-Session, User-Directed, Device-to-Device Session Transfer System," which the United States Patent & Trademark Office duly issued on March 13, 2007. A true and correct copy of the '233 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

8. The inventions of the '233 Patent are applicable to, among other things, a transfer of an on-going software session from one device to another device.

Defendant's Infringing Products and Methods

9. Cox Communications purports to be the third-largest cable entertainment and broadband service provide in the United States, and the third-largest cable television provider, with over six million customers.¹ To provide such services to its customers, Cox Communications provides its customers with reception equipment, including set top boxes. Cox

¹ <http://cox.mediaroom.com/index.php?s=65>.

Communications provides video on demand products and services to its customers by pushing content onto its customers' digital video recorders ("DVRs").

10. Upon information and belief, Defendant makes, uses, sells, leases, imports and offers for sale products that allow users to transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device, including but not limited to its Record 6 DVR receiver products ("Defendant's Infringing Products"). For example, Defendant's Record 6 DVR products include, for example, a Record 6 DVR as a primary receiver, coupled to additional set top boxes, and Cox Communication's Contour service. Defendant purports that when a Record 6 DVR is networked to another set top box, the recordings on the Record 6 DVR can be accessed by users via any of the set top boxes, and that users can "even start watching in one room and finish in another."² Users can "[s]witch rooms and keep watching[;] pause [the] recorded show in one room and resume watching in another."³

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF THE '233 PATENT

11. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1-10 herein by reference as if set forth here in full.

12. Upon information and belief, Defendant has been and is currently directly infringing, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '233 Patent by making, using, offering to sell, and/or selling within the United States, and/or importing into the United States, without authority, products and services that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device. Without limitation, and by example only, Defendant directly infringes and continues to directly infringe at least claim 23 of the '233 Patent by making, selling, using and offering for sale at least a Record 6 DVR set top box (including model

² <http://ww2.cox.com/residential/tv/dvr.cox>.

³ *Id.*

EXP4642HDC), a Record 6-capable receiver (including model 4742HDC), among other set top boxes, and the Contour service, among other services. Additionally, Defendant directly infringes and continues to directly infringe at least claim 1 of the '233 Patent by making, using, selling, and offering for sale at least the Contour television service.

13. Defendant also directly infringes one or more claims of the '233 Patent by directing and/or controlling its employees, executives, users, agents, affiliates, suppliers and customers to use the aforementioned products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device within the United States.

14. To the extent that any claim is construed to require a system, Defendant also directly infringes one or more claims of the '233 Patent by providing to users software, hardware and/or platforms that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device, thus putting the aforementioned system into use.

15. By using the methods claimed in the '233 Patent and by making, selling, importing, offering for sale and/or using the aforementioned products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device, Defendant has been and is now directly infringing under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) one or more claims of the '233 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

16. Upon information and belief, upon knowledge of the '233 Patent (at least since the filing date of this Complaint) Defendant is contributing to the infringement of the '233 Patent by, among other things, knowingly and with intent, actively encouraging its customers, suppliers, agents, users and affiliates to make, use, sell and/or offer for sale at least a Record 6 DVR set top box (including model EXP4642HDC), a Record 6-capable receiver (including model 4742HDC), among other set top boxes, and the Contour service, among other services, which constitutes

infringement of at least claims 1 and 23 of the '233 Patent. For example, to the extent that any claim is construed to require a system, Defendant provides components, including software, hardware and/or platforms, for use in networked systems, which transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device. Defendant knows that such products constitute a material part of the inventions of the '233 Patent, knows those products to be especially made or adapted to infringe the '233 Patent, and knows that those products are not staple articles or commodities of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

17. By contributing to its customers', suppliers', agents', users' and affiliates' use of the apparatus and methods claimed in the '233 Patent and their making and/or using the aforementioned web content reformatting products, Defendant has been and is now indirectly infringing under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c) one or more claims of the '233 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

18. Upon information and belief, upon knowledge of the '233 Patent (at least since the filing date of this Complaint), Defendant is inducing infringement of the '233 Patent by, among other things, knowingly and with intent, actively encouraging its customers, suppliers, users, agents and affiliates to make, use, sell and/or offer for sale Defendant's aforementioned products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device in a manner that constitutes infringement of one or more claims of the '233 Patent, with the knowledge and specific intent to encourage, direct and facilitate those infringing activities, and knowing that such activities infringe the '233 Patent, including through the creation and dissemination of promotional and marketing materials, instructional materials, product materials and technical materials. For example, Defendant provides users with materials explaining how to operate the Record 6 DVR, including explaining that the user can pause a program in one room,

and then resume watching that program in another room.⁴

19. To the extent that Defendant's users can be considered to put the aforementioned products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device into use (for example, to the extent any claim is construed to require such a system), then Defendant would also be inducing infringement of the '233 Patent by, among other things, knowingly and with intent (at least since the filing date of this Complaint) actively encouraging its users to make and use Defendant's aforementioned products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device in a manner that constitutes infringement of one or more claims of the '233 Patent, with the knowledge and specific intent to encourage, direct and facilitate those infringing activities, and knowing that such activities infringe the '233 Patent, including through the creation and dissemination of promotional and marketing materials, instructional materials, product materials and technical materials.

20. By inducing its customers', suppliers', users', agents' and affiliates' use of the apparatus and methods claimed in the '233 Patent and its making and/or using at least a Record 6 DVR top box (including model EXP4642HDC), a Record 6-capable receiver (including model 4742HDC), among other set top boxes, and the Contour service, among other services, Defendant has been and is now indirectly infringing under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least claims 1 and 23 of the '233 Patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

21. As a result of Defendant's unlawful infringement of the '233 Patent, CRFD has suffered and will continue to suffer damage. CRFD is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages adequate to compensate for such infringement, which have yet to be determined.

22. Defendant will continue to infringe the '233 Patent unless and until it is enjoined by this Court.

⁴ *Id.*

23. Defendant, by way of its infringing activities, has caused and continues to cause CRFD to suffer damages in an amount to be determined at trial. CRFD has no adequate remedy at law against Defendant's acts of infringement and, unless Defendant is enjoined from its infringement of the '233 Patent, CRFD will suffer irreparable harm.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, CRFD respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor as follows:

A. Holding that Defendant has directly infringed, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more of the claims of the '233 Patent;

B. Holding that Defendant has indirectly infringed, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more of the claims of the '233 Patent;

C. Permanently enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, affiliates, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents and all others acting in concert or privity with any of them from infringing, inducing the infringement of, or contributing to the infringement of the '233 Patent;

D. Permanently enjoining the use of the products that transfer an on-going software session from one device to another device created or used according to the patented methods of the '233 Patent;

E. Awarding to CRFD the damages to which it is entitled under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendant's past infringement and any continuing or future infringement up until the date Defendant is finally and permanently enjoined from further infringement, including compensatory damages;

- F. Declaring this to be an exceptional case and awarding CRFD's attorneys' fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285;
- G. Awarding CRFD costs and expenses in this action;
- H. Awarding CRFD pre- and post-judgment interest on its damages; and
- I. Awarding CRFD such other and further relief in law or in equity as this Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

CRFD, under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requests a trial by jury of any and all issues so triable by right.

Dated: January 17, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

FARNAN LLP

/s/ Brian E. Farnan
Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)
Michael J. Farnan (Bar No. 5165)
919 North Market Street, 12th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 777-0300
bfarnan@farnanlaw.com
mfarnan@farnanlaw.com

Of Counsel:

Mark S. Raskin
Robert Whitman
John Petrsoric
Eric Berger
Mishcon De Reya New York LLP
750 Seventh Ave., 26th Floor
New York, NY 10003

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
CRFD Research, Inc.*