		FLED
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Nathaniel L. Dilger, Esq. (Bar No. 196203) ndilger@onellp.com Ryan Abbott, MD, Esq. (Bar No. 281641) rabbott@onellp.com Joseph K. Liu, Esq. (Bar No. 216227) jliu@onellp.com ONE LLP 4000 MacArthur Blvd. West Tower, Suite 1100 Newport Beach, CA 92660 Telephone: (949) 502-2870 Facsimile: (949) 258-5081	2013 NOV -5 AM 11: 04 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT GENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. SANTA AHA
8 9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Near Infrared Imaging, Inc., and The Researc Foundation of the City University of New Yo	ch ork
11	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
12		CT OF CALIFORNIA
13	NEAR INFRARED IMAGING. INC., a	Case No. SACV13-01744 DOC (RNBx)
14	Delaware corporation; and THE RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF THE	
15	CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, a New York not-for-profit educational	COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT
16	corporation,	PERMANENT INJUNCTION AND DAMAGES
17	Plaintiffs,	
18	V.	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
19	CHRISTIE MEDICAL HOLDINGS, INC.,	
20	a California corporation; and CHRISTIE DIGITAL SYSTEMS USA, INC., a	
21	California corporation,	
22	Defendants.	
23		2 2
24	Plaintiffs Near Infrared Imaging, Inc. ("NII") and The Research Foundation of The
25	City University of New York ("RF-CUNY")	
26	Defendants Christie Medical Holdings, Inc. ('	
27	Systems USA, Inc. ("Christie Digital") (collec	
28		
	СОМР	LAIN I

1	PARTIES
2	1. Plaintiff NII is a Delaware corporation having its principal office located at
3	Wrentham, Massachusetts 02093.
4	2. Plaintiff RF-CUNY is a New York not-for-profit educational corporation
5	having its principal office located at 230 West 41st St., 7th Floor, New York, New York
6	10036.
7	3. On information and belief, Defendant Christie Medical is a California
8	corporation with a principal place of business at 10550 Camden Drive, Cypress, CA 90630.
9	4. On information and belief, Defendant Christie Digital is a California
10	corporation with a principal place of business at 10550 Camden Drive, Cypress, CA 90630.
11	NATURE OF THE ACTION
12	5. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the
13	United States 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq., including 35 U.S.C. § 271.
14	6. On information and belief, Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe,
15	contribute to the infringement of, and/or actively induce others to infringe Plaintiffs' U.S.
16	Patent No. 5,929,443 ("the '443 patent").
17	JURISDICTION AND VENUE
18	7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28
19	U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
20	8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because, on information
21	and belief, Defendants do and have done substantial business in this judicial District,
22	including: (i) committing acts of patent infringement and/or contributing to or inducing acts
23	of patent infringement by others in this judicial District and elsewhere in this State; (ii)
24	regularly conducting business in this State and judicial District; (iii) directing advertising to
25	or soliciting business from persons residing in this State and judicial District through at
26	least in-person sales efforts; and (iv) engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, and/or
27	deriving substantial revenue from products and/or services provided to persons in this
28	District and State.
	2

COMPLAINT

9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

10. Among other things, Plaintiff NII is a manufacturer of medical imaging technology products, such as the AVV-1 illumination device. The technology underlying the AVV-1 illumination device was invented at CUNY and assigned to Plaintiff RF-CUNY.

11. Plaintiffs have sought protection for their technological innovations, which has resulted in several issued patents, including the asserted '443 patent.

12. The '443 Patent issued on July 27, 1999, and is titled "Imaging of Objects Based Upon the Polarization or Depolarization of Light." RF-CUNY is the owner by assignment of the '443 Patent, and NII the exclusive licensee.

13. On information and belief, Defendants develop, market, and/or manufacture products for the medical industry, including the VeinViewer Vision, the VeinViewer Vision(XTND), and the VeinViewer Flex, all of which are devices to assist health care providers with obtaining peripheral vascular access.

14. On information and belief, Defendant Christie Medical operates and maintains a website at www.christiedigital.com/en-us/medical/, where Christie's products are marketed to consumers worldwide, and where Christie specifically instructs those customers on how to use those products.

15. One of Defendants' products is described and marketed as VeinViewer Vision. The VeinViewer Vision is an exemplary product that infringes the '443 Patent and is referred to hereafter as the "VVV." On information and belief, the VeinViewer Vision (XTND) and the VeinViewer Flex likewise infringe the '443 Patent.

COUNT ONE

(Infringement of the '443 Patent against All Defendants – 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 et seq.)

Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs, as 16. though fully set forth herein.

17. On information and belief, Defendants have had actual knowledge of the '443 Patent. Defendants acquired the rights to the infringing VeinViewer technology through their purchase of Luminetx, Inc. Luminetx was a company founded by Herbert D. Zeman, a developer of the original VeinViewer, and a named inventor on patents describing technology closely related to the technology that is described and claimed in the asserted '443 patent.

18. At least Dr. Zeman is aware, or should have been aware, of the '443 Patent and the intellectual property rights reflected therein. One reason for this is that Dr. Zeman worked and lectured in a relatively small scientific community together with the inventors of the '443 Patent. Researchers in these areas were generally aware of one another's work, and – on information and belief – Dr. Zeman was well aware of the work of the inventors of the '443 patent, including being well aware of the '443 patent itself. For similar reasons, Defendants are likewise well aware of the work of the inventors of the '443 patent, including being well aware of the '443 patent itself.

19. Further confirming Christie's awareness of the '443 patent is that NII emailed Defendants in January 2013 to explicitly inform them of their infringement. Defendants have thus had actual knowledge and/or constructive notice of the '443 patent since at least January, 2013 and – on information and belief – well prior to this date.

20. Despite having full knowledge of the '443 patent, Defendants have directly infringed and continue to directly infringe one or more claims of the '443 Patent by developing, making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, in this District, elsewhere in the United States, and internationally, at least the VVV and other similar products that infringe the '443 patent. On information and belief, these other similar infringing products include the VeinViewer Vision (XTND) and the VeinViewer Flex.

21. In particular, Defendants have directly infringed the '443 patent by using the VVV to perform the following steps: (a) illuminating with light either the surface of a turbid medium (such as human tissue) or an object (such as a blood vessel) within or behind the turbid medium, whereby light is backscattered from the illuminated surface or

4

1

2

object; (b) detecting and separating with the VVV a pair of complementary polarization image components of the backscattered light; and (c) forming an image of the illuminated surface or object using the separated complementary polarization image components.

22. Defendants have contributed to the infringement of and continue to contributorily infringe one or more claims of the '443 Patent by developing, making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, in this District, elsewhere in the United States, and internationally the VVV. In particular, Defendants developed, made, used, offered to sell, sold and/or imported, the VVV with full knowledge of the '443 patent and its applicability to the VVV.

23. In addition, the VVV is not a staple article of commerce and has no substantial non-infringing use. In particular, on information and belief, Defendants' customers use the VVV solely in a manner the infringes the '443 patent, which includes the steps of using the VVV to (a) illuminate with light either the surface of a turbid medium (such as human tissue) or an object (such as a blood vessel) within or behind the turbid medium, whereby light is backscattered from the illuminated surface or object; (b) detecting and separating with the VVV a pair of complementary polarization image components of the backscattered light; and (c) forming an image of the illuminated surface or object using the separated complementary polarization image components. Using the VVV in this infringing manner is the only substantial use for the VVV.

24. Defendants have induced infringement of and continue to induce infringement of one or more claims of the '443 Patent by developing, making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, in this District and elsewhere in the United States, the VVV. Among other things, Defendants have – with full knowledge of the '443 patent and its applicability to the VVV – specifically designed the AAPS to be used in a manner that infringes the '443 patent and has specifically instructed their customers to use the VVV in this manner. In particular, Defendants have specifically instructed its customers to use the VVV to perform the following steps: (a) illuminating with light either the surface of a turbid medium (such as human tissue) or an object (such as a blood vessel) within or behind the turbid medium, whereby light is backscattered from the illuminated surface or
object; (b) detecting and separating with the VVV a pair of complementary polarization
image components of the backscattered light; and (c) forming an image of the illuminated
surface or object using the separated complementary polarization image components. Such
use directly infringes one or more claims of the '443 patent.

25. One example of Defendants instructing their customers to use the VVV in a manner that infringes the '443 patent can be found at: <u>http://www.christiedigital.com/en-us/medical/education/product-videos/Pages/VeinViewer-Vision.aspx.</u>

26. Defendants' actions constitute direct infringement, contributory infringement, and/or active inducement of infringement of one or more claims of the '443 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

27. NII and RF-CUNY have sustained damages and will continue to sustain damages as a result of Defendants' aforesaid acts of infringement.

28. NII and RF-CUNY are entitled to recover damages sustained as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount to be proven at trial.

29. Defendants' infringement of NII's rights under the '443 Patent will continue to damage NII and RF-CUNY's business, causing irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless it is enjoined by this Court.

30. In addition, Defendants have infringed the '443 patent – directly, contributorily, and by inducement – with full knowledge of the '443 patent and despite being notified that their actions constituted infringement of that patent. For at least this reason, Defendants have willfully infringed the '443 Patent, entitling NII and RF-CUNY to increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorney fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

COMPLAINT

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs NII and RF-CUNY ask this Court to enter judgment in
 their favor and against Defendants Christie Medical Holdings, Inc. and Christie Digital
 Systems USA, Inc. and grant the following relief:

1	A.	An adjudication that Defendants Christie Medical Holdings, Inc. and Christie
2	Digital Sys	tems USA, Inc. have willfully infringed and continue to infringe the '443 patent.
3	B.	Orders of this Court temporarily, preliminarily, and permanently enjoining

Defendants Christie Medical Holdings, Inc. and Christie Digital Systems USA, Inc., their agents, servants, and any and all parties acting in concert with any of them, from directly or indirectly infringing in any manner any of the claims of the '443 patent pursuant to at least 35 U.S.C. § 283;

An award of damages adequate to compensate NII and RF-CUNY for 8 C. 9 Defendants Christie Medical Holdings, Inc.'s and Christie Digital Systems USA, Inc.'s infringement of the '443 patent in an amount to be proven at trial; 10

D. A finding that this is an exceptional case and an award of Plaintiffs' costs and attorney fees;

A trebling of the damage award to Plaintiffs; E.

F. An assessment and award of pre- and post-judgment interest on all damages 14 awarded; and 15

Any further relief that this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: November 5, 2013

I.

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ONE LLP

By:

Nathaniel L. Dilger, Esc Ryan Abbott, MD, Esq. Joseph K. Liu Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Near Infrared Imaging, Inc., and The Research Foundation of the City College of New York

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
2	Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury as to all claims and all issues properly triable
3	thereby.
4	
5	Dated: November 5, 2013 ONE LLP
6	NULLI PQ
7	By: Nathaniel L. Dilger, Esq.
8	Ryan Abbott, MD, Esq.
9	Joseph K. Liu Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Near Infrared Imaging,
10	Inc., and The Research Foundation of the City
11	College of New York
12	
13	
14 15	
15 16	
10	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	8 COMPLAINT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

٠,

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES JUDGES

 This case has been assigned to District Judge
 David O. Carter
 and the assigned

 Magistrate Judge is
 Robert N. Block
 .

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV13-01744 DOC (RNBx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge.

Clerk, U. S. District Court

November 5, 2013

Date

By <u>Maria Barr</u> Deputy Clerk

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Western Division 312 N. Spring Street, G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012

- Southern Division
 411 West Fourth St., Ste 1053
 Santa Ana, CA 92701
- Eastern Division
 3470 Twelfth Street, Room 134
 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

- 1	4
------------	---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS (Che				(Check box if you are rep			
NEAR INFRARED IMAGING, IN EQUNDATION OF THE CITY U educational corporation	(C., a Delaware corporat NIVERSITY OF NEW YOR	ion; and THE RESEARCH K, a New York not-for-pro		CHRISTIE MEDICAL HOLDINGS, INC., a California corporation; and CHRISTIE DIGITAL SYSTEMS USA, INC., a California corporation			
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, are representing yourself, QNE LLP 4000 MacArthur Blvd., West T Newport Beach, CA 92660 (949) 502-2870	provide same inform	one Number. If you ation.)		Name, Address and Telep ourself, provide same infor			
II, BASIS OF JURISDIC	FION (Place an X in c	ne box only.)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PR	INCIPAL PARTIES-For D k for plaintiff and one for d	viversity Cases Only		
	C Rodorol O	uartian (US	Citizen of This State	F DEF	Principal Place PTF DEF		
Plaintiff	1. U.S. Government X 3. Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party Plaintiff Government Not a Party			of Business in th	his State		
		Indiana Chinanahin		2 2 2 Incorporated ar of Business in A	nd Principal Place 🔲 5 🗍 5 .nother State		
2. U.S. Government Defendant	of Parties in		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Soreign Nation	6 6		
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X	n one box only.)						
1. Original 2.1	Removed from tate Court	3. Remanded from Appellate Court		nsferred from Another	Multi- District itigation		
V. REQUESTED IN COM	IPLAINT: JURY DE	MAND: 🗙 Yes 🗌	No (Check "Yes" or	nly if demanded in com	plaint.)		
CLASS ACTION under	F.R.Cv.P. 23:	Yes X No		NDED IN COMPLAINT:	\$ To be determined		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Patent Infringement under the	(Cite the U.S. Civil Statu	te under which you are fil	ing and write a brief statemer	nt of cause. Do not cite jurisdi	ctional statutes unless diversity.)		
Patent Initingement under t	le Patent Laws of the O	nited States, 55 0.5.C. 99 1	, स उस्प.		j		
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one b	ox only).			(*******************************		
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT	T. IMMIGRATION	PRISONER PETITIONS	PROPERTY RIGHTS		
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land	462 Naturalization Application	Habeas Corpus:	820 Copyrights		
400 State Reapportionment	🔲 120 Marine	245 Tort Product Liability	465 Other	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	X 830 Patent		
410 Antitrust	130 Miller Act	290 All Other Real	Immigration Actions	Sentence	840 Trademark		
430 Banks and Banking	140 Negotiable	TORTS	TORTS PERSONAL PROPERTY	530 General	SOCIAL SECURITY		
450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc.	150 Recovery of	PERSONAL PROPERTY		Other:	862 Black Lung (923)		
460 Deportation	Overpayment & Enforcement of	310 Airplane 315 Airplane	371 Truth in Lending	540 Mandamus/Other	863 DIWC/DIWW (405 (g))		
470 Racketeer Influ-	Judgment	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	550 Civil Rights	864 SSID Title XVI		
enced & Corrupt Org.	151 Medicare Act	320 Assault, Libel & Slander		555 Prison Condition	865 RSI (405 (g))		
480 Consumer Credit	152 Recovery of Defaulted Student	330 Fed. Employers	- Floduct Elability		FEDERAL TAX SUITS		
490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Com-	Loan (Excl. Vet.)	340 Marine	BANKRUPTCY	Confinement FORFEITURE/PENALTY	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or		
modities/Exchange	153 Recovery of Overpayment of	345 Marine Product	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	625 Drug Related	Defendant) 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC		
890 Other Statutory Actions	Vet. Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	USC 881	7609		
891 Agricultural Acts	160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	CIVIL RIGHTS	690 Other			
893 Environmental Matters	190 Other Contract	Product Liability 360 Other Personal		LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards			
895 Freedom of Info. Act	195 Contract Product Liability	Injury 362 Personal Injury Med Malpratice	441 Voting 442 Employment	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt.			
896 Arbitration	196 Franchise	365 Personal Injury	443 Housing/ Accomodations	Relations			
899 Admin. Procedures	REAL PROPERTY	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	445 American with	740 Railway Labor Act			
Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	210 Land Condemnation	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury	Disabilities- Employment	751 Family and Medical Leave Act			
- · ·		Product Liability	446 American with	790 Other Labor			
	220 Foreclosure			Litigation			
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	220 Foreclosure	368 Asbestos Personal Injury	Disabilities-Other	1 Litigation 791 Employee Ret. Inc.			

CV-71 (09/13)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Case Number:

.

·..... .

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII. VENUE: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Question A: Was this case removed from state court?	STATE CASE WAS PI	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:				
🗌 Yes 🕱 No	Los Angeles		Western			
If "no, " go to Question B. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San	Luis Obispo		Western		
corresponding division in response to	Orange			Southern		
Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	Riverside or San Bernardino			Eastern		
Question B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a party to this	f If the United States, or o	ne of its agencies	or employees, is a party, is it	:		
action?	A PLAINTIFF?		A DEFENDANT?		INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:	
Yes 🗙 No	Then check the box below for the co which the majority of DEFENDANT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of PLAINTIFFS reside.			
If "no, " go to Question C. If "yes," check the	Los Angeles		Los Angeles		Western	
box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo		Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo		Western	
Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	Orange		range	So	Southern	
	Riverside or San Bernardino		verside or San Bernardino	Ea	Eastern	
	Other		Other		Western	
	А. В.	C.	D.	E.	F.	
	ngeles Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties	Orange County	Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	Outside the Central District of California	Other	
Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside:					X	
Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:						
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:		X				
C.1. Is either of the following true? If so, c	heck the one that applies:	C.2. Is either	of the following true? If so	o, check the one that appli	es:	
X 2 or more answers in Column C		2 or more answers in Column D				
only 1 answer in Column C and no	answers in Column D	only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C				
Your case will initially be SOUTHERN DIV Enter "Southern" in response t	ISIOŇ.	Your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION.				
If none applies, answer quest	- ,	Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below. If none applies, go to the box below.				
	Your case will i	initially be assigne	d to the	• •		
	WES Enter "Western" in r	TERN DIVISION. response to Quest	ion D below.			

Question D: Initial Division?	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD
Enter the initial division determined by Question A, B, or C above:	SOUTHERN DIVISION

	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CIVIL COVER SHEET	CALIFORNIA	۱.
IX(a). IDENTICAL CASES	: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed?	× NO	YES
If yes, list case number(s	:):		
IX(b). RELATED CASES:	Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case?	X NO	YES
If yes, list case number(s	s):		
Civil cases are deemed rela	ted if a previously filed case and the present case:		
(Check all boxes that apply)	A. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or		
	B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fa	act; or	
	C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges;	or	
	D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright <u>, and one of the factors identified above in</u>	۱ a, b or c also is pre	esent.
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTO (OR SELF-REPRESENTED		E: November	5, 2013

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (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. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet).

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))