

1 TROJAN LAW OFFICES
2 R. Joseph Trojan CA Bar No. 137,067
trojan@trojanlawoffices.com
3 Dylan C. Dang, CA Bar No. 223,455
dang@trojanlawoffices.com
4 Francis Z. Wong, CA Bar No. 284,946
wong@trojanlawoffices.com
5 9250 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 325
6 Beverly Hills, CA 90212
7 Telephone: 310-777-8399
8 Facsimile: 310-777-8348

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
10 Arovast Corporation and Etekcity Corporation

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 Arovast Corporation, a California
14 Corporation, and Etekcity
15 Corporation, an Iowa Corporation,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 Okaysou Corporation, a California
19 Corporation, Hao Ma, an individual,
20 and Yan Huang, an individual,

21 Defendants.

Case No. 8:22-cv-1037

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR
INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT
NOS. D942,604 and D936,200 UNDER
35 U.S.C. § 271**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

22 Plaintiff Arovast Corporation (hereinafter, "Arovast") and Plaintiff Etekcity
23 Corporation (hereinafter, "Etekcity") hereby complain against Defendants Okaysou
24 Corporation, Hao Ma, and Yan Huang (hereinafter collectively, "Defendants") as
25 follows:
26
27

1 regularly conducts business throughout the United States and in this judicial
2 district.

3
4 6. Defendant Okaysou is engaged in the manufacture, importation,
5 distribution, promotion, and/or sale of air purifiers, including the following
6 Accused Products:

7
8 (a) The Cayman 608 air purifier, which infringes United States Design Patent
9 No. D942,604 (hereinafter, “604 Patent”);

10 (b) The Apollo 718 air purifier, which infringes United States Design Patent
11 No. D936,200 (hereinafter, “200 Patent”); and,

12 (d) Any other air purifiers having a substantially similar appearance
13 regardless of the trademark applied by Defendant Okaysou.
14

15
16 7. Defendant Hao Ma is the Chief Executive Officer of Defendant Okaysou.
17 On information and believe, Defendant Hao Ma is the principal officer of
18 Defendant Okaysou responsible for approving the manufacture, importation, and/or
19 sale of the Accused Products and orchestrates the infringing activities from
20 Defendant Okaysou’s principal place of business in the Central District of
21 California. On information and belief, Defendant Hao Ma resides at 201 E
22 Chapman Ave, Apt, 43G, Placentia, CA 92870.
23
24

25 8. Defendant Hao Ma knew, or should have known, the manufacture and/or
26 sale of the Accuse Products were an infringement of Plaintiffs’ patent rights, and
27

1 certainly knew after being placed on actual notice of the patent rights when
2 informed by Plaintiff that Defendant Okaysou was infringing Plaintiffs' patent
3 rights. Yet, Defendant Hao Ma has chosen to continue to orchestrate the sale of
4 the Accused Products. As a consequence, Defendant Hao Ma has and is actively
5 and knowingly aided and abetted the infringement, resulting in personal liability
6 attaching to Defendant Hao Ma for the infringement.
7
8

9 9. Defendant Yan Huang is the Director of Defendant Okaysou. On
10 information and believe, Defendant Yan Huang is the sole director of Defendant
11 Okaysou responsible for ratifying all actions taken by Defendant Hao Ma in Ma's
12 capacity as Chief Executive Officer, including the ratification of the manufacture
13 and/or sale of the Accused Products and orchestration of the infringing activities
14 from Defendant Okaysou's principal place of business in Ontario, California. On
15 information and believe, Defendant Yan Huang provides Board support for the
16 infringing activities by approving the allocation of financial and other resources for
17 the manufacture, importation, and sale of the Accused Products. On information
18 and belief, Defendant Yan Huang resides at 2010 Napoli Ct, #103, Corona, CA
19 92881.
20
21
22
23

24 10. Defendant Yan Huang knew, or should have known, the manufacture
25 and/or sale of the Accuse Products were an infringement of Plaintiffs' patent rights,
26 and certainly knew after being placed on actual notice of the patent rights when
27

1 informed by Plaintiffs that Defendant Okaysou was infringing Plaintiffs’ patent
2 rights. Yet, Yan Huang has chosen to continue to ratify and approve the allocations
3 of resources for the sale of the Accused Products. As a consequence, Defendant
4 Yan Huang has and is actively and knowingly aided and abetted the infringement,
5 resulting in personal liability attaching to Defendant Yan Huang for the
6 infringement.
7
8

9 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 11. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’
11 patent infringement claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1338(a).
12

13 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they
14 have manufactured, used, imported, sold, and/or advertised products which infringe
15 the ‘604 and ‘200 Patents within the Central District of California and/or have
16 approved, authorized, ratified, and/or provided material support for the infringing
17 activities within the Central District of California.
18

19 13. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391
20 and § 1400 because the acts complained of herein have been committed and are
21 being committed in this Judicial District under the pending jurisdictional authority
22 of this Court. Furthermore, venue is proper in the Central District, based on this
23 Court’s personal jurisdiction over the Defendants as a result of their infringing
24 activities in the Central District.
25
26
27

IV. FIRST COUNT FOR INFRINGEMENT OF UNITED STATES PATENT NO. D942,604

14. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 13.

15. Plaintiff Etekcity owns by assignment the exclusive right to make, use, import, sell, and advertise the ornamental design described and claimed in the ‘604 Patent. Plaintiff Arovast is the exclusive licensee under the ‘604 Patent.

16. Defendants manufacture, import, market, and/or sale the Cayman 608 air purifier or aid and abet the same. The Cayman 608 air purifier is shown below in comparison to the ‘604 Patent and the Plaintiffs’ patented air purifier:

TROJAN LAW OFFICES
BEVERLY HILLS

D942,604 claims: “The ornamental design for an air purifier, as shown and described.”

U.S. Patent Feb. 1, 2022 Sheet 1 of 8 US D942,604 S




FIG.1

Etekcity’s Core 400s Smart True HEPA Air Purifier (front.)



Okaysou’s Cayman 608 (front.)



1 17. 35 U.S.C. § 289 defines design patent infringement as the application of
2 “the patented design, or any colorable imitation thereof, to any article of
3 manufacture for the purpose of sale or selling or exposing for sale any article of
4 manufacture to which the design or colorable imitation has been applied.” The
5 standard for infringement is whether an ordinary observer, taking into account the
6 prior art, would believe the accused design to be the same as the patented design.
7

8
9 18. Applying the test for design patent infringement to the Cayman 608 air
10 purifier by comparing it to the design in the ‘604 Patent, there is no question that
11 the Cayman 608 air purifier is substantially the same in appearance. Therefore, the
12 Cayman 608 air purifier infringes the ‘604 Patent. Defendants have violated
13 Plaintiffs’ patent rights by engaging in the manufacture, importation, use, sale,
14 advertising, and/or offer for sale of air purifiers having the appearance of the
15 Cayman 608 air purifier regardless of branding and/or aiding and abetting in the
16 same.
17
18

19
20 19. The alleged infringing articles have not been manufactured or
21 authorized in any manner by Plaintiffs.
22

23 20. As a legal consequence of Defendants’ infringement, Plaintiffs have
24 been irreparably harmed and are entitled to lost profits under 35 U.S.C. § 289, pre-
25 judgment interest, compensation for loss of convoy sales, price erosion, loss of
26 market share, and a preliminary and permanent injunction.
27

1 21. Defendants have had actual notice of Plaintiffs’ patent rights, but have
2 failed to discontinue the manufacture, importation, use, sale, advertising, and/or
3 offer for sale of the Cayman 608 air purifier without justification. These continued
4 activities constitute willful infringement of the ‘604 Patent, thereby entitling
5 Plaintiffs to treble damages and attorney fees under 15 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285.
6
7

8 **V. SECOND COUNT FOR INFRINGEMENT OF**
9 **UNITED STATES PATENT NO. D936,200**

10 22. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference the allegations contained in
11 paragraphs 1 through 13.
12

13 23. Plaintiff Etekcitiy owns by assignment the exclusive right to make, use,
14 import, sell, and advertise the ornamental design described and claimed in the ‘200
15 Patent. Plaintiff Arovast is the exclusive licensee under the ‘200 Patent.
16


17 24. Defendants manufacture, import, market, and/or sale the Apollo 718 air
18 purifier or aid and abet the same. The Apollo 718 air purifier is shown below in
19 comparison to the ‘200 Patent and the Plaintiffs’ patented air purifier:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TROJAN LAW OFFICES
BEVERLY HILLS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

D936,200 claims: the ornamental design for an air purifier, as shown and described.

U.S. Patent Nov. 16, 2021 Sheet 1 of 8 US D936,200 S



Etekcity's vital 100 True HEPA air purifier (front.)



Okaysou's Apollo 718 (front.)



25. 35 U.S.C. § 289 defines design patent infringement as the application of “the patented design, or any colorable imitation thereof, to any article of manufacture for the purpose of sale or selling or exposing for sale any article of manufacture to which the design or colorable imitation has been applied.” The standard for infringement is whether an ordinary observer, taking into account the prior art, would believe the accused design to be the same as the patented design.

26. Applying the test for design patent infringement to the Apollo 718 air purifier by comparing it to the design in the ‘200 Patent, there is no question that the Apollo 718 air purifier is substantially the same in appearance. Therefore, the Apollo 718 air purifier infringes the ‘200 Patent. Defendants have violated Plaintiffs’ patent rights by engaging in the manufacture, importation, use, sale, advertising, and/or offer for sale of air purifiers having the appearance of the Apollo 718 air purifier regardless of branding and/or aiding and abetting in the

1 same.

2 27. The alleged infringing articles have not been manufactured or
3 authorized in any manner by Plaintiffs.
4

5 28. As a legal consequence of Defendants' infringement, Plaintiffs have
6 been irreparably harmed and are entitled to lost profits under 35 U.S.C. § 289, pre-
7 judgment interest, compensation for loss of convoy sales, price erosion, loss of
8 market share, and a preliminary and permanent injunction.
9

10 29. Defendants have had actual notice of Plaintiffs' patent rights, but have
11 failed to discontinue the manufacture, importation, use, sale, advertising, and/or
12 offer for sale of the Apollo 718 air purifier without justification. These continued
13 activities constitute willful infringement of the '200 Patent, thereby entitling
14 Plaintiffs to treble damages and attorney fees under 15 U.S.C. §§ 284 and 285.
15
16

17 **V. PRAYER OF RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully prays for the following relief:

19 a. A preliminary injunction barring Defendants and all of their agents,
20 officers, attorneys, successors, and assigns from manufacturing, importing, using,
21 selling, and/or offering for sale any product that infringe the '604 and '200 Patents;
22

23 b. A permanent injunction barring Defendants and all of their agents,
24 officers, attorneys, successors, and assigns from manufacturing, using, selling,
25 and/or offering for sale any product that infringes the '604 and '200 Patents;
26
27

1 c. A judgment against Defendants of \$5,000,000 or actual compensatory
2 damages, adequate to compensate Plaintiffs for all of their losses, including
3 prejudgment interest, lost profits, Defendants’ profits, loss of convoy sales, price
4 erosion, and loss of market share;
5

6 d. Treble damages and attorney fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 284 and
7
8 285 for the willful infringement of the ‘604 and ‘200 patents by Defendants;

9 e. Costs of suit and prejudgment interest against Defendants; and

10 f. Any and all other relief that the Court deems proper.
11

12 **VI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff hereby exercises its right to a jury trial under the Seventh
14 Amendment to the United States Constitution and hereby demand a jury trial in
15 accordance therewith.
16

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 TROJAN LAW OFFICES
19 By

20
21 Dated: May 23, 2022

22 /s/R. Joseph Trojan
23 R. Joseph Trojan
24 Attorney for Plaintiffs
25 Arovast Corporation and
26 Etekcity Corporation
27

TROJAN LAW OFFICES
BEVERLY HILLS