

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

EXECWARE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

MACY'S, INC., MACYS.COM, INC. and  
BLOOMINGDALE'S BY MAIL, LTD.  
d/b/a BLOOMINGDALES.COM,

Defendants.

C.A. No. \_\_\_\_\_

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Execware, LLC files its Complaint for Patent Infringement against Defendants Macy's, Inc. and Macys.com, Inc. ("Macy's") and Bloomingdale's By Mail, Ltd. d/b/a bloomingdales.com ("Bloomingdale's") (collectively, "Defendants"), alleging, based on Defendants' knowledge of their actions and the actions of others, and based on Execware's information and belief as to all other matters.

**PARTIES**

1. Execware, LLC is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, having its principal offices at 3440 South Jefferson Street #1125, Falls Church, Virginia 22041.

2. On information and belief, Defendant Macy's, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with a place of business located at 7 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Macy's, Inc. can be served via its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 2711 Centerville Road, Suite 400, Wilmington, Delaware 19808.

3. On information and belief, Defendant Macys.com, Inc. is a subsidiary of Macy's, Inc. and is a New York corporation with a place of business located at 7 West Seventh Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202. Macys.com, Inc. can be served via its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 80 State Street, Albany, New York 12207.

4. On information and belief, Macy's, Inc. owns Defendant Bloomingdale's By Mail, Ltd. d/b/a bloomingdales.com, which is a New York limited company with a place of business located at 919 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Bloomingdale's By Mail, Ltd. can be served via its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 80 State Street, Albany, New York 12207.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This is an action for infringement of a United States patent arising under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, 284, 285, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1338(a).

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). Upon information and belief, Defendants receive service of process in this district, Defendants have transacted business in this district, and Defendants have directly and indirectly committed acts of patent infringement in this district.

7. Defendants are subject to this Court's specific and general personal jurisdiction under due process and the Delaware Long Arm Statute due at least to Defendants' receiving service of process and substantial business in this district, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Delaware.

**COUNT I**  
**INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,216,139**

8. On April 10, 2001, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”) duly and legally issued United States Patent No. 6,216,139 (“the 139 patent”), titled “Integrated Dialog Box for Rapidly Altering Presentation of Parametric Text Data Objects on a Computer Display,” invented by Robert Listou.

9. Execware is the owner of the 139 patent with all substantive rights in and to that patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the 139 patent against infringers, and to collect damages for all relevant times.

10. Defendants have notice of their infringement of the 139 patent at least from the filing and service dates of this Complaint.

11. Defendants, alone, or with one or more of their customers or suppliers directly (literally and under the doctrine of equivalents) and indirectly infringed (under induced and contributory infringement) one or more claims of the 139 patent in this district and in the United States by, among other ways, making, having made, selling, offering for sale, using, or importing products that format and reformat tabular displays of records, parameters, and text data objects under their <http://www1.macys.com/> and [http://www1.bloomingdales.com/\\_websites](http://www1.bloomingdales.com/_websites) (hereinafter, “Accused Products”).<sup>1</sup>

12. Defendants specifically intended to induce infringement of the 139 patent by taking active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, to cause their customers, suppliers, and distributors to make, use, sell, offer for sale, import, or otherwise provide the Accused Products in a manner that directly infringed one or more claims of the 139

---

<sup>1</sup> Execware accuses Defendants of past, present, and future infringement of the 139 patent. All allegations of infringement or acts leading to infringement are made in the past tense, rather than also in the present and future tense, strictly for simplicity’s sake.

patent. Defendants' specific intent is shown by, for example, their advertising, advising, consulting, instructing, guiding, or directing their customers, suppliers, and distributors how to make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import the Accused Products in a directly infringing manner. Defendants had sufficiently detailed knowledge of the activities of their customers, suppliers, and distributors since at least the filing of this Complaint.

13. Defendants specifically intended to contribute to the infringement of one or more claims of the 139 patent by designing or making software components of the Accused Products that are especially designed or made for use with computer systems and other mobile or static devices or systems in an infringing manner. To the extent Defendants did not provide these computer systems and devices, it took active steps, directly or through contractual relationships, to cause direct infringement by their customers, suppliers, and distributors from their advertising, advising, consulting, instructing, guiding, or directing their customers, suppliers, and distributors how to integrate such computer systems and devices with the Accused Products. Defendants had knowledge of their contributory infringement since at least the filing of this Complaint.

14. The Accused Products has hardware or software components that are especially designed and adapted for use with such other computer systems and devices in carrying out the formatting and reformatting tabular displays of records, parameters, and text data objects, as seen by how prominently these functions are promoted by Defendants on their websites and in their marketing literature. These components in the Accused Products constitute a material part of the invention of one or more asserted claims of the 139 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing uses. These distinct and separate components are used only to perform the formatting and reformatting functionality and not any other functionality.

15. Execware has been, is being, and will continue to be damaged by Defendants' infringing conduct. Defendants is liable to Execware for damages in an amount that adequately compensates Execware for Defendants' infringement. By law, this amount is no less than a reasonable royalty for Defendants' and their customers', suppliers', and distributors' use of their Accused Products, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

### **JURY DEMAND**

Execware requests a jury trial for the claims asserted in this Complaint.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Execware requests this Court to find in its favor, against Defendants, and that this Court grant Execware the following relief.

a. Judgment that Defendants directly infringed of one or more claims of the 139 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, or that Defendants, alone or in combination with others, indirectly infringed one or more claims of the 139 patent, either contributorily or by induced infringement;

b. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, their officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting together with Defendants from directly infringing, contributorily infringing, or inducing infringement of the 139 patent;

c. Judgment that Defendants account for and pay to Execware all damages and costs that Execware incurred from Defendants' direct or indirect infringing activities and conduct described in this Complaint;

d. Judgment that this Court grant Execware its pre- and post-judgment interest on its damages caused by Defendants' directly and indirectly infringing activities and conduct

described in this Complaint;

e. Judgment that this Court declare this an exceptional case and award Execware its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

f. Judgment that this Court grant all additional relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 21, 2014

BAYARD, P.A.

OF COUNSEL:

Zachariah S. Harrington  
Matthew J. Antonelli  
Larry D. Thompson, Jr.  
Peter J. Corcoran, III  
ANTONELLI, HARRINGTON &  
THOMPSON LLP  
4200 Montrose Blvd., Ste. 430  
Houston, TX 77006  
(713) 581-3000  
zac@ahtlawfirm.com  
matt@ahtlawfirm.com  
larry@ahtlawfirm.com  
pete@ahtlawfirm.com

/s/ Richard D. Kirk  
Richard D. Kirk (rk0922)  
Stephen B. Brauerman (sb4952)  
Vanessa R. Tiradentes (vt5398)  
Sara E. Bussiere (sb5725)  
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 655-5000  
rkirk@bayardlaw.com  
sbraerman@bayardlaw.com  
vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com  
sbussiere@bayardlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Execware, LLC