UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

ILIFE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12-CV-05157
v.	§	
	§	
LIFELINE SYSTEMS COMPANY;	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
LIFELINE SYSTEMS, INC.; PHILIPS	§	
ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA	§	
CORPORATION; and PHILIPS LIFELINE,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

This is a patent infringement action by iLife Technologies, Inc. ("iLife") against Lifeline Systems Company, Lifeline Systems, Inc., Philips Electronics North America Corporation, and any unknown or unnamed entities doing business as Philips Lifeline (collectively, "Defendants").

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff iLife Technologies, Inc. is a Texas corporation with its principal place of business in this Judicial District.
- 2. On information and belief, Defendant Lifeline Systems Company is a Massachusetts corporation with its principal place of business at 111 Lawrence St., Framingham, Massachusetts 01702. Lifeline Systems Company has appointed Mark Beucler, 111 Lawrence St., Framingham, MA 01702, as its registered agent for service of process.
- 3. On information and belief, Defendant Lifeline Systems, Inc. is a Massachusetts corporation with its principal place of business at 111 Lawrence St., Framingham, Massachusetts 01702. Lifeline Systems, Inc. has appointed Mark Beucler, 111 Lawrence St., Framingham, MA 01702, as its agent for service of process.

- 4. On information and belief, Defendant Philips Electronics North America Corporation is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 3000 Minuteman Road, Andover, Massachusetts 01810. Philips Electronics North America has appointed Corporation Service Company, 84 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109, as its agent for service of process.
- 5. On information and belief, Defendants are doing business as Philips Lifeline. This complaint is brought against Defendants and any yet unidentified or unnamed entities doing business as Philips Lifeline or substantially participating in the design, manufacture, or distribution of the Accused Product and Service identified below.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101, et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 7. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). On information and belief, Defendants have transacted business in this District and have committed acts of patent infringement in this District.
- 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because the Accused Products and Services, as described below, have been and continue to be purchased, leased, or used by consumers in the State of Texas and the Northern District of Texas. Defendants have committed acts of infringement in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271 and directly or indirectly placed these infringing Accused Products and Services into the stream of commerce, through established distribution channels, with the knowledge or understanding that such Accused Products and Services are used and sold in this State and this Judicial District.
- 9. Defendants, directly or indirectly, offer for sale, sell, ship, and distribute their Accused Products and Services within the State of Texas and this Judicial District. Defendants, directly or indirectly, have purposefully and voluntarily placed the Accused Products and

Services, as described below, into the stream of commerce with the expectation that it will be purchased, leased, or used by consumers in the Northern District of Texas.

- 10. Defendants derive substantial revenue from the sale or leasing of infringing products distributed within the District, or expect or should reasonably expect their actions to have consequences within the District, and derive substantial revenue from interstate and international commerce.
- 11. Defendants knowingly induced or contributed to infringement within this District by contracting with others to market, sell, or lease infringing products and services with the knowledge and intent to facilitate infringing sales or leases of the products by others within this District and by creating or disseminating data sheets and other instruction materials for the products with like mind and intent.
- 12. Defendants regularly do business, solicit business, engage in other persistent acts of conduct, or derive substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Texas and in this District.
- 13. iLife is a Texas company with its principal place of business in this District. These acts cause injury to iLife within the District.

PATENTS IN SUIT

14. iLife is the owner by assignment of all rights, title, and interest in and under the following United States Letters Patents and has standing to sue for the past, present, and future infringement of the following United States Letters Patents:

Patent	Title	Issue Date	Exhibit
U.S. Pat. No. 6,307,481	"Systems for Evaluating Movement of a	10/23/2001	Ex. 1
("the '481 Patent")	Body and Methods of Operating the Same"		
U.S. Pat. No. 6,501,386	"System Within a Communication Device	12/31/2002	Ex. 2
("the '386 Patent")	for Evaluating Movement of a Body and		
	Methods of Operating the Same"		

Patent	Title	Issue Date	Exhibit
U.S. Pat. No. 6,703,939	"System and Method for Detecting Motions	03/09/2004	Ex. 3
("the '939 Patent")	of a Body"		
U.S. Pat. No. 6,864,796	"System and Method Within a	03/08/2005	Ex. 4
("the '796 Patent")	Communication Device for Evaluating		
	Movement of a Body and Methods of		
	Operating the Same"		
U.S. Pat. No. 7,095,331	"System and Method for Detecting Motion	08/22/2006	Ex. 5
("the '331 Patent")	of a Body"		
U.S. Pat. No. 7,145,461	"System and Method for Analyzing Activity	12/05/2006	Ex. 6
("the '461 Patent")	of a Body"		
U.S. Pat. No. 7,479,890	"System and Method for Analyzing Activity	01/20/2009	Ex. 7
("the '890 Patent")	of a Body"		

15. The '481 Patent, '386 Patent, '939 Patent, '796 Patent, '331 Patent, '461 Patent, and '890 Patent are collectively referred to as the "Asserted Patents."

ACCUSED PRODUCTS

- 16. Defendants make, import, offer for sale, sell, lease, or use systems or methods for detecting, evaluating, or analyzing movement of a body covered by one or more claims of the Asserted Patents. Infringing systems or methods include, but are not limited to, a product called "Philips Lifeline with AutoAlert" (the "Accused Product") and a service called Philips Lifeline Medical Alert Service ("Service"). The Accused Product includes the "Philips Lifeline AutoAlert Help Button" and "Philips Lifeline CarePartner Communicator." The Service includes providing an end user with the Accused Product and remotely monitoring fall alert signals from the Accused Product at a Philips Lifeline Response Center. The Service includes receipt, analysis, and response to fall alert signals from the Accused Product.
- 17. Each of the Defendants is involved in the same transaction or series of transactions relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling of the same Accused Product or process.
- 18. Defendants direct and control the actions of end users through, *inter alia*, the "Philips Lifeline Care Plan Agreement" relating to the lease of the Accused Product and provision

of the Service to Defendants' end user customers. On information and belief, Defendants direct and control the actions of third party providers of the Service through contracts. The end users and third party providers of the Service jointly infringe one or more method claims of the Asserted Patents by acting as required by the terms of their respective contracts with the Defendants.

WILLFULNESS

- 19. iLife's parent company, iLife Solutions, Inc., had business dealings with Defendants from 2004 to 2006 concerning iLife's proprietary personal emergency response system with fall detection capabilities covered by the Asserted Patents.
- 20. The exchanges included written and oral communications between Michael Lehrman (named inventor, Chairman, and Chief Scientific Officer) and others for iLife Solutions and Michael Bellomo (Director of Engineering), Deborah Cotrin (VP Marketing), and others for Lifeline Systems. Among other things, iLife representatives, including Lehrman, informed Lifeline representatives, including Bellomo, of the issued Asserted Patents covering the technology under discussion. Philips acquired Lifeline Systems in August 2005.¹
- 21. At the time, Defendants did not have a personal emergency response system with a fall detection sensor. The parties entered into a confidentiality agreement, and Defendants obtained confidential and proprietary information from iLife concerning its proprietary fall detection devices. Defendants also analyzed and conducted testing on iLife's fall detection devices. In December 2005, Lifeline signed a letter of intent concerning the purchase and licensing of iLife's fall detection technology. However, Defendants ultimately decided not to enter into a purchase agreement and license with iLife.

¹ See http://www.newscenter.philips.com/main/standard/about/news/news/article-15249.wpd.

22. In the spring of 2010, Philips Lifeline introduced its own personal emergency response system with an automatic fall detector.² Based on their dealings with iLife, Defendants were aware of at least the '483, '386, and '939 Patents and knew or should have known that their Accused Products and Services directly or indirectly infringe one or more claims of the Asserted Patents.

COUNT ONE PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '481 Patent

- 23. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 24. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '481 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- 25. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '481 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Product and providers of the Service who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '481 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 26. Defendants' infringement of the Asserted Patents has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 27. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.

² See http://www.newscenter.philips.com/main/standard/news/press/2010/20100322 lifeline.wpd.

28. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '481 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '481 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT TWO PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '386 Patent

- 29. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 30. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '386 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- 31. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '386 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '386 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 32. Defendants' infringement of the '386 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 33. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 34. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '386 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '386 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT THREE PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '939 Patent

- 35. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 36. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '939 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- 37. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '939 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '939 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 38. Defendants' infringement of the '939 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 39. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 40. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '939 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '939 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT FOUR PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '796 Patent

- 41. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 42. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '796 Patent under 35

U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.

- 43. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '796 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '796 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 44. Defendants' infringement of the '796 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 45. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 46. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '796 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '796 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT FIVE PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '331 Patent

- 47. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 48. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '331 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- 49. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '331 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused

Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '331 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.

- 50. Defendants' infringement of the '331 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 51. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 52. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '331 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '331 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT SIX PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '461 Patent

- 53. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 54. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '461 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- 55. Defendants have infringed and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '461 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '461 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 56. Defendants' infringement of the '461 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.

- 57. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 58. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '461 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '461 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

COUNT SEVEN PATENT INFRINGEMENT The '890 Patent

- 59. iLife repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 60. Defendants have been and are still directly infringing, and indirectly infringing by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '890 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, offering to sell, selling, leasing, or using the Accused Product or Service.
- by inducing or contributing to infringement of, one or more claims of the '890 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by directing and controlling, *inter alia*, the actions of end users of the Accused Products who, acting alone or in concert with others under a contract, individually or jointly infringe one or more method claims of the '890 Patent at the behest of the Defendants.
- 62. Defendants' infringement of the '890 Patent has caused damage to iLife for which it is entitled to recover compensatory damages in an amount not yet determined.
- 63. On information and belief, Defendants' infringing conduct will continue unless enjoined by this Court, resulting in continuing harm and irreparable damage to iLife.
- 64. On information and belief, Defendants' infringement of the '890 Patent was willful as one or more of the Defendants, who were acting in concert with one another, were actually aware of the '890 Patent from past business dealings and negotiations with iLife.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

65. iLife demands that all issues be determined by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff iLife Technologies, Inc. respectfully requests that:

- 1. The Court enter judgment Defendants have infringed the Asserted Patents;
- 2. Defendants be ordered to pay iLife its damages for infringement of the Asserted Patents along with enhanced damages for willful infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- 3. Defendants be ordered to pay iLife pre-judgment and post-judgment interest to the full extent allowed under the law, as well as its costs;
- 4. The Court find that this is an exceptional case and award iLife the costs of this action and attorneys' fees as provided by U.S.C. § 285;
- 5. Defendants and their agents, servants, and employees, and all those in privity with Defendants or in active convert and participation with Defendants, be permanently enjoined from further infringement of the Asserted Patents; and
- 6. The Court grant iLife such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael C. Wilson

Michael C. Wilson mwilson@munckwilson.com Texas Bar No. 21704590 S. Wallace Dunwoody wdunwoody@munckwilson.com Texas Bar No. 24040838 John S. Torkelson jtorkelson@munckwilson.com Texas Bar No. 00795154

MUNCK WILSON MANDALA, LLP

600 Banner Place Tower 12770 Coit Road Dallas, Texas 75251 Telephone: 972.628.3600

Telecopier: 972.628.3616

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF, ILIFE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

569348

$_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~09/11)}$ Case 3:12-cv-05157-N Document 1 Filed 12/18/12 Page 14 of 14 PageID 14

The JS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States inSeptember 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE hv.	STRUCTIONS ON NEXT FAGE	OF THIS FORM.)							
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			DEFENDANTS						
				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION O THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Number	r)		Attorneys (If Know	n)				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" i	in One Box Only)	III. C	<u>l</u> ITIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box for Pi	laintiff)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	`		Citiz	$ (For \ Diversity \ Cases \ Only) \\ $				or Defendant) PTF DF □ 4 □	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	1 2 1 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5 5	1 5
NA NATURE OF CHU	r.			en or Subject of a oreign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6 □	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) RTS	F	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Z BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury - Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending Aso Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Ott 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	AY	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Applicati 53 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 55 Other Immigration	422 Appe 423 With 28 U PROPEI 820 Copy 830 Pater 840 Trade 861 HIA 862 Black 863 DIW 864 SSID 865 RSI (FEDER 870 Taxe 871 IRS 26 U	BANKRUPICY □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal		OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
□ 1 Original □ 2 Re	ite Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reo	pened ano ano (spe	nsferred from ther district reify) statutes unless d	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	į								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	N D	EMAND \$		CHECK YES only:		complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASI PENDING OR CLOS	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	OGE		