1	Kevin P.B. Johnson (Bar No. 177129)				
2	kevinjohnson@quinnemanuel.com Ray Zado (Bar No. 208501)				
3	rayzado@quinnemanuel.com Heather Belville (Bar No. 262328)				
4	heatherbelville@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP				
5	555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Fifth Floor Redwood Shores, California 94065 Telephone: (650) 801-5000				
6	Facsimile: (650) 801-5100				
7	Edward J. DeFranco (Bar No. 165596)				
8	eddefranco@quinnemanuel.com Eric Huang (pro hac vice pending)				
9	erichuang@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP 51 Madison Avenue, 22 nd Floor New York, NY 10010 Telephone: (212) 849-7000 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100				
10					
11					
12	Rory S. Miller (Bar No. 238780)				
13	rorymiller@quinnemanuel.com QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP				
14	865 South Figueroa Avenue, 10 th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017 Talanhara (212) 442 2000				
15	Telephone: (213) 443-3000 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100				
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff SONY ELECTRONICS INC.				
17	SONT ELECTRONICS INC.				
18	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COU	JRT		
19	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
20	SONY ELECTRONICS INC., a Delaware	Case No.:	'11CV0732 BEN MDD		
21	corporation,	SONY ELECT	FRONICS INC.'S		
22	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF JURY TRIAL DEMANDED			
23	vs.				
24		JUNI INIAL	DEMIANDED		
25	LG ELECTRONICS, INC., a Korean corporation,				
26	Defendant.				
27					
28					

02347.51822/4081916.1

Plaintiff Sony Electronics Inc. files this complaint against LG Electronics, Inc.:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Sony Electronics Inc. ("Sony") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 16530 Via Esprillo, San Diego, California 92127. Sony sells, offers for sale, and/or distributes in the United States HDTV products and digital cameras.
- 2. Upon information and belief, Defendant LG Electronics, Inc. ("LG Electronics") is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of Korea, with its principal place of business at LG Twin Towers, 20 Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul 150-721, South Korea. Upon information and belief, LG Electronics regularly conducts business within this judicial District.

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 3. This is a declaratory judgment action seeking a determination that Sony does not infringe any valid or enforceable claim of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,537,612; 6,281,895; 6,598,233; 7,154,564; and 7,760,491 (collectively, the "Patents-in-Suit") under 35 U.S.C. § 271, and that these patents are invalid under at least 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.
- 4. On information and belief, LG Electronics is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 5,537,612 (the "612 Patent") is entitled "Remotely Selectable Audio/Video/Text Disruption," and indicates on its face that it issued on July 16, 1996. A true copy of the '612 patent is attached as Exhibit A.
- 5. On information and belief, LG Electronics is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 6,281,895 ("the '895 patent") is entitled "Level Adjust Display Apparatus and Method for On-Screen Display Menu in Image Display Device," and indicates on its face that it issued on August 28, 2001. A true copy of the '895 patent is attached as Exhibit B.
- 6. On information and belief, LG Electronics is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 6,598,233 ("the '233 patent") is entitled "Channel Control Apparatus of Digital

•	l
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	ĺ

2

3

Television and Method Thereof," and indicates on its face that it issued on July 22, 2003. A true copy of the '233 patent is attached as Exhibit C.

- 7. On information and belief, LG Electronics is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 7,154,564 ("the '564 patent") is entitled "Method for Controlling Channel Tuning of Digital TV," and indicates on its face that it issued on December 26, 2006. A true copy of the '564 patent is attached as Exhibit D.
- 8. On information and belief, LG Electronics is the owner by assignment of United States Patent No. 7,760,491 ("the '491 patent") is entitled "Display Apparatus," and indicates on its face that it issued on July 20, 2010. A true copy of the '491 patent is attached as Exhibit E.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. This lawsuit is an action for declaratory relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101, *et seq.* This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 10. LG Electronics is subject to personal jurisdiction in this Court because, on information and belief, it does and has done substantial business in this judicial District, including: (i) regularly doing business or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or deriving substantial revenue from products and/or services provided to individuals in this District and in this State; and (ii) initiating and participating in litigation asserting the same patents-in-suit in this judicial District.
- 11. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because LG Electronics regularly conducts business in this judicial district, has regular and established places of business in this judicial district, and/or because certain of the acts alleged herein occurred in this judicial district.

24

25

26

27

9

7

10

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

THE SUBSTANTIAL CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE PARTIES

- 12. Sony is a leading distributor of HDTV products and digital cameras in the United States.
- 13. On February 4, 2011, LG Electronics filed suit against Sony in this judicial District alleging that Sony's products infringed the patents-in-suit in a case captioned *LG Electronics, Inc.* v. Sony Corporation et al., S.D. Cal. Case No. 11-0248-DMS (WMC). On April 8, 2011, one business day before Sony was due to answer, LG Electronics voluntarily dismissed that suit without prejudice. Upon information and belief, this dismissal was not based upon any discussion with Sony, and Sony lacks knowledge as to why LG Electronics filed the notice of dismissal. Consequently, LG Electronics has not ceased to threaten Sony with claims of infringement of the patents-in-suit.
- 14. Sony has not infringed and does not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of any of the patents-in-suit, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.
- 15. By virtue of the foregoing, a substantial controversy exists between the parties that is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant declaratory relief. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time so that Sony may ascertain its rights regarding the patentsin-suit.

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '612 Patent)

- 16. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.
- 17. The '612 patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.

- 1			
1	18.	As a result of	
2	substantial controversy		
3	judgment.		
4	19.	A judicial de	
5		J	
6	rights regard	ing the '612 pa	
7		(Declarator	
8	20.	Sony realle	
9	naraoranhs a	s though fully	
10			
11	21.	Sony has no	
12	enforceable of	claim of the '6	
13	22.	As a result of	
14	substantial c	ontroversy of s	
15	judgment.		
16	23.	A judicial de	
17	riohts regard	ing the '612 pa	
18		g the 012 pe	
19		(Declar	
20	24.	Sony realleg	
21	paragraphs a	s though fully	
22	25.	The '895 pa	
23		-	
24		mply with one	
25	26.	As a result of	
26	uhatantial a	antroxyaraxy of a	

	18.	As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a
substa	antial co	ontroversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory
udgn	nent.	

19. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its ights regarding the '612 patent.

<u>COUNT II</u> ry Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '612 Patent)

- 20. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding raphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.
- 21. Sony has not infringed and does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '612 patent.
- 22. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 23. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its rights regarding the '612 patent.

<u>COUNT III</u> Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '895 Patent)

- 24. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.
- 25. The '895 patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.
- 26. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

27

- 1				
1	27.	A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its		
2	rights regarding the '895 patent.			
3		COUNT IV		
4		(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '895 Patent)		
5	28.	Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding		
6	paragraphs as	s though fully set forth in this Paragraph.		
7	29.	Sony has not infringed and does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and		
8	enforceable claim of the '895 patent.			
9	30.	As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a		
10	substantial co	entroversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory		
11 12	judgment.			
13	31.	A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its		
14	rights regarding the '895 patent.			
15	8 8	COUNT V		
16		(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '233 Patent)		
17	32.	Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding		
18	paragraphs as	s though fully set forth in this Paragraph.		
19	33.	The '233 patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or		
20	otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.			
21	34.	As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a		
22	substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declarator			
23	judgment.			
24				
25	35.	A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its		
26	rights regardi	ng the '233 patent.		
27				
$_{28}$				

COUNT VI

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '233 Patent)

- 36. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.
- 37. Sony has not infringed and does not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '233 patent.
- 38. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 39. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its rights regarding the '233 patent.

COUNT VII

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '564 Patent)

- 40. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.
- 41. The '564 patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or otherwise comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.
- 42. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 43. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that Sony may ascertain its rights regarding the '564 patent.

COUNT VIII

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '564 Patent)

44. Sony realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth in this Paragraph.

1	M. That Sony be granted such other and additional relief as the Court deems just and		
2	proper.		
3	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
4	Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Sony Electronics		
5	Inc. requests a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.		
6			
7	DATED: April 8, 2011 Respectfully submitted,		
8	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP		
9			
10	By s/ Rory S. Miller		
11	Rory S. Miller Attorneys for Sony Electronics Inc.		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
02347.51822/4081916.1	-10-		

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet 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 in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE I	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
Sony Electronics, Inc.			LG Electronics, In	c.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego, CA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
	e, Address, and Telephone Number) Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP r, Redwood Shores, CA, 94065; (650) 80		Attorneys (If Known)	'11 CV0732 BEN	MDD	
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		en of Another State	of Business In A	Another State	
			en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & □ PERSONAL INJURY □ 362 Personal Injury Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury Product Liability	RY	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal	□ 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 □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
№ 1 Original □ 2 R	tate Court Appellate Court	Reop	pened anothe (specif	4 /		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 28 U.S.C. 2201 and 2202, and the					
vi. chest of heri	Brief description of cause: Complaint for Declaratory Judgmen	nt of Pate	ent Noninfringement	and Invalidity		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:			EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE Dana M.	Sabraw		DOCKET NUMBER 3:	11-cv-00248-DMS -WMC	
DATE 04/08/2011	SIGNATURE OF A' /S/ Kevin P.B.					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	