

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

CREEKVIEW IP LLC, Plaintiff, v. STANLEY BLACK & DECKER, INC., Defendant.	Case No. 3:22-cv-01948 Patent Case Jury Trial Demanded
--	--

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Creekview IP LLC (“Plaintiff”), through its attorneys, complains of Stanley Black & Decker, Inc. (“Defendant”), and alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Creekview IP LLC is a limited liability company with its principal place of business at 7548 Preston Rd, STE 141 PMB 1115, Frisco, TX 75034.
2. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware, having a principal place of business at 1000 Stanley Drive New Britain, CT 06053. Upon information and belief, Defendant may be served with process c/o Corporation Service Company d/b/a CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service Company, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, TX 78701.

JURISDICTION

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 exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District. As described below, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District, and Defendant is incorporated in in this District. In addition, Plaintiff has suffered harm in this district.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

7. On March 28, 2017, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) duly and legally issued U.S. Patent No 9,608,472 (the “‘472 Patent”), entitled “METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR WIRELESSLY TRANSFERRING POWER AND COMMUNICATING WITH ONE OR MORE SLAVE DEVICES” after a full and fair examination. The ‘472 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein as if fully rewritten.
8. Plaintiff is presently the owner of the ‘472 Patent, having received all right, title and interest in and to the ‘472 Patent from the previous assignee of record. Plaintiff possesses all rights of recovery under the ‘472 Patent, including the exclusive right to recover for past infringement.
9. To the extent required, Plaintiff has complied with all marking requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

COUNT 1: INFRINGEMENT OF THE ‘472 PATENT

10. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.
11. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the ‘472 Patent in at least this District by making, using, offering to sell, selling and/or importing, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count

below (among the “Exemplary Defendant Products”) that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the ‘472 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the “Exemplary ‘472 Patent Claims”) literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the ‘472 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

12. Defendants also have directly infringed, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary ‘472 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.
13. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary ‘472 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the ‘472 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary ‘472 Patent Claims.
14. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.
15. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendants’ infringement.

JURY DEMAND

16. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief:

- A. A judgment that the ‘472 Patent is valid and enforceable;
- B. A judgment that Defendants have infringed, one or more claims of the ‘472 Patent;
- C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;

- D. A judgment that awards Plaintiff all appropriate damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendants' infringement with respect to the '472 patent;
- E. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for Defendants' infringement, an accounting:
 - i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 285 and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendants that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
 - ii. that Plaintiff be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in prosecuting this action; and
 - iii. that Plaintiff be awarded such further relief at law or in equity as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

THE MORT LAW FIRM, PLLC

/s/Raymond W. Mort, III
Raymond W. Mort, III
Texas State Bar No. 00791308
raymort@austinlaw.com

THE MORT LAW FIRM, PLLC
501 Congress Ave, Suite 2000
Austin, TX 78701
Tel/Fax: 512-865-7950

Together with:

CHONG LAW FIRM PA

Jimmy Chong (#4839) (*pro hac vice* to be filed)

2961 Centerville Road, Suite 350
Wilmington, DE 19808
Telephone: (302) 999-9480
Facsimile: (302) 800-1999
Email:
chong@chonglawfirm.com

Counsel for Plaintiff
Creekview IP LLC