

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**SHENZHEN KANGDI ELECTRONIC &
PLASTIC CO. LTD.; SHENZHEN
HANTING TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD.;
SHENZHEN MEIFEN TECHNOLOGY
CO., LTD.; YONG KANG SHICHENGHE
FITNESS EQUIPMENT BUSINESS CO.,
LTD.; YUEQING XINGUANG PLASTICS
CO., LTD.; YUEQING XINGUANG-
XIONG LIANG; AND WENZHOU
XIONGCAI TRADING CO., LTD.**

Plaintiff,

v.

**MICHAEL KEHOE d/b/a SHAMROCK
TRIPLE GYM,**

Defendant.

Case No. 1:22-cv-6794

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Shenzhen Kangdi Electronic & Plastic Co. Ltd.; Shenzhen Hanting Technology Co. Ltd.; Shenzhen MeiFen Technology Co., Ltd.; Yong Kang Shichenghe Fitness Equipment Business Co., Ltd.; YueQing XinGuang Plastics Co., Ltd.; Yueqing Xinguang-Xiong Liang; and WenZhou XiongCai Trading Co., Ltd. (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) files this Declaratory Judgment action against Defendant Michael Kehoe d/b/a Shamrock Triple Gym (“Defendant” or “Shamrock”) and alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for declaratory judgment of patent invalidity and non-infringement arising under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.*, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1 *et seq.* Plaintiffs are seeking a declaratory judgment of invalidity and

non-infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10,898,752 (“the ’752 Patent”) and U.S. Patent No. 11,484,746 (“the ’746 Patent”) (collectively, “Patents-in-Suit”).

2. In addition, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has violated the common law of the State of Illinois by committing tortious interference with a contractual relationship and tortious interference with a prospective business expectancy.

3. Plaintiffs now seek a declaratory judgment of invalidity and non-infringement of the Patents-in-Suit, as well as a judgment that Defendant has tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs’ contractual relationships with Amazon and tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs’ prospective business expectancies.

THE PARTIES

4. Plaintiff Shenzhen Kangdi Electronic & Plastic Co. Ltd. (“KAKICLAY”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “KAKICLAY.”

5. Plaintiff Shenzhen Hanting Technology Co. Ltd. (“Doeplex”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “Doeplex.”

6. Plaintiff Shenzhen MeiFen Technology Co., Ltd. (“HandSonic”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “HandSonic.”

7. Plaintiff Yong Kang Shichenghe Fitness Equipment Business Co. (“NEWAN”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “NEWAN.”

8. Plaintiff YueQing XinGuang Plastics Co., Ltd (“Fimor”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “Fimor”

9. Plaintiff Yueqing Xinguang-Xiong Liang, (“Armpow”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “Armpow.”

10. Plaintiff WenZhou XiongCai Trading Co., Ltd, (“MasiStranth”) is a company organized and existing under the laws of the People’s Republic of China and sells on Amazon under the store name “MasiStranth”

11. Plaintiffs are all Chinese business entities who operate the identified Amazon storefronts selling workout equipment.

12. Upon information and belief, Defendant is an individual residing in Dublin, Republic of Ireland. Defendant can be contacted and has respond from the electronic mail address: mickk240@gmail.com.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

13. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 1338(a), 1367, and 2201(a).

14. This Court also has original jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action against Dovetail pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (a)(2) & (b). Plaintiffs are citizens of China. Defendant is a resident of the Republic of Ireland. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

15. This Court may exercise supplemental jurisdiction of Plaintiffs’ state law tort claim against Defendant under 28 U.S.C. § 1367, as they arise under the same set of operative facts.

16. On information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant as Defendant has constitutionally sufficient contacts with this District so as to make personal jurisdiction over Defendant proper as Defendant has committed the acts complained of herein within this District. Furthermore, upon information and belief, Defendant owns and/or operates the Amazon storefront Shamrock Triple Gym through which Defendant sells workout equipment products that practice the Patents-in-Suit within the forum state and within this District.

17. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 as Defendant is a foreign citizen who resides in Ireland.

THE '752 PATENT

18. The '752 Patent is entitled "Foldable Exercise Device" and generally discloses a foldable exercise device with a chin-up exercise apparatus and a dip exercise apparatus suspended from the chin-up exercise apparatus. *See* Exhibit A, copy of the '752 Patent.

19. The '752 Patent was filed on August 28, 2020 and claims priority as a continuation of application No. 16/945,864, filed on Aug. 1, 2020. The '752 Patent issued on January 26, 2021.

20. Defendant is the named inventor and applicant of the '752 Patent.

THE '746 PATENT

21. The '746 Patent is entitled "Foldable Exercise Device" and generally discloses a foldable exercise device with a chin-up exercise apparatus and a dip exercise apparatus suspended from the chin-up exercise apparatus. *See* Exhibit B, copy of the '746 Patent.





22. The '746 Patent is the parent application of the '752 Patent and was filed on August 1, 2020 and issued on November 1, 2022.




23. Defendant is the named inventor and applicant of the '746 Patent.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

24. Plaintiffs are sellers of, among other things, workout equipment via their respective Amazon storefronts, as identified herein. Plaintiffs have enjoyed considerable commercial success over time on Amazon.

25. Plaintiffs all sell identical workout equipment under different brand names:

| Plaintiffs' Workout Equipment | Associated Brand Name | ASIN |
|---|-----------------------|------------|
|  | KAKICLAY | B09BCLRHYL |
|  | Doeplex | B09NM1TV9W |
|  | HandSonic | B0B2DPCLFF |
|  | NEWAN | B09HS76CBD |

| | | |
|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|
|  | <p>Fimor</p> | <p>B08BPG4LK1</p> |
|  | <p>Armpow</p> | <p>B08GFMRBQQ B09MVKNS55</p> |
|  | <p>MasiStranth</p> | <p>B09D3HLCD1 B0B2L7GT39</p> |

26. Plaintiffs’ supplier is the owner of Chinese Utility Patent No. CN 214971472 and U.S. Design Patent Application No. 29/797283, which both practice and embody Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products.

27. Plaintiffs’ Amazon sales are conducted under the Amazon Services Solutions Agreement.

28. On or around October 2022, Defendant filed several Amazon Infringement Complaints (Complaint IDs: 11004034401, 11012744131, 11036387991, 10942199021) against Plaintiffs’ workout equipment product listings (ASINs: B09BCLRHYL, B09NM1TV9W, B0B2DPCLFF, B09HS76CBD, B08BPG4LK1, B08GFMRBQQ, B09MVKNS55, B09D3HLCD1, B0B2L7GT39), alleging infringement of the ’752 Patent.

29. These Amazon Infringement Complaints were made in bad faith, as Defendant knew that Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products do not infringe the ’752 Patent.

30. On November 10, 2022, in response to Complaint ID 11004034401, counsel for Plaintiff KAKICLAY sent a letter via electronic mail to Defendant outlining how the infringement allegations are meritless. *See* Exhibit C, Plaintiff letter to Defendant.

31. Defendant responded on November 11, 2022, admitting Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the '752 Patent, but rather infringe the '746 Patent. *See* Exhibit D, Email thread. However, Defendant did not file an Amazon Infringement Complaint concerning the '746 Patent.

32. Plaintiffs responded that same day pointing out the inconsistencies in Defendant's infringement allegations and requested immediate retraction of Complaint ID 11004034401. *Id.*

33. Defendant refused to withdraw the Complaint despite notice and knowledge of non-infringement regarding the '752 Patent. *Id.*

34. By filing Amazon Infringement Complaints against Plaintiffs for the '752 Patent, Defendant has made bad faith allegations that are knowingly and objectively false.

35. As a direct result of the bad faith and false Amazon Infringement Complaints, Plaintiffs' workout equipment product listings have been delisted from Amazon, prohibiting Plaintiff from selling on Amazon, thereby directly causing harm to Plaintiff's current and future business operations.

36. Therefore, an actual and justiciable controversy exists between the Parties concerning the validity of the Patents-in-Suit and whether Plaintiffs' workout equipment products infringe the Patents-in-Suit.

37. Furthermore, an actual and justiciable controversy exists between the Parties as to whether Defendant tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs' contractual relationships with Amazon and whether Defendant tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs' prospective business expectancies.

CLAIM I: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '752 PATENT

38. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

39. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 10, 12, 15, and 18 of the '752 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2018/0085622 entitled "Doorway Fitness Tower and Parallel Bar" to Ivan *et al.* ("Ivan"). Ivan was published on March 29, 2019. Exhibit E, the Ivan Patent App.

40. For example, exemplary claim 1 is invalid as anticipated by Ivan because Ivan teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Ivan discloses a foldable exercise device. (Ivan ¶ [0004]).
- Ivan discloses a dip exercise apparatus. (Ivan ¶ [0023]).
- Ivan discloses two vertical members, where each vertical member has a top end and a bottom end, where the top end is configured to suspend the dip exercise apparatus from a chin-up apparatus, where the bottom end has a bottom grip, where the bottom grip can be rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration, and a bottom grip biasing mechanism that biases the bottom grip to the exercise configuration. (Ivan ¶ [0025]).
- Ivan discloses a horizontal connecting member configured to keep the two vertical members spaced apart at a predefined distance, in the exercise configuration the bottom grips are substantially perpendicular to the two vertical members and the horizontal connecting member and when suspended can be used to do dip exercises,

and in the flat configuration the bottom grips and the horizontal connecting member are substantially parallel. (Ivan ¶ [0029]).

41. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 10, 12, 15, and 18 of the '752 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2013/0225373 entitled "Upper Body Exercise Device Extension" to Poat ("Poat"). Poat was published August 29, 2013. Exhibit F, the Poat Patent App.

42. For example, exemplary claim 1 is invalid as anticipated by Poat because Poat teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Poat discloses a foldable exercise device. (Poat ¶ [0020]).
- Poat discloses a dip exercise apparatus. (Poat ¶ [0020]).
- Poat discloses two vertical members, where each vertical member has a top end and a bottom end, where the top end is configured to suspend the dip exercise apparatus from a chin-up apparatus, where the bottom end has a bottom grip, where the bottom grip can be rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration, and a bottom grip biasing mechanism that biases the bottom grip to the exercise configuration. (Poat ¶ [0020]).
- Poat discloses a horizontal connecting member configured to keep the two vertical members spaced apart at a predefined distance, in the exercise configuration the bottom grips are substantially perpendicular to the two vertical members and the horizontal connecting member and when suspended can be used to do dip exercises, and in the flat configuration the bottom grips and the horizontal connecting member are substantially parallel. (Poat ¶ [0022]).

43. Claims 1-2, 5-6, and 12 of the '752 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2013/0244836 entitled "Door Frame Mounted Exercise Device and System" to Maughan *et al.* ("Maughan"). Maughan was published September 19, 2013. Exhibit G, the Maughan Patent App.

44. For example, exemplary claim 1 is invalid as anticipated by Maughan because Maughan teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Maughan discloses a foldable exercise device. (Maughan ¶ [0043]).
- Maughan discloses a dip exercise apparatus. (Maughan ¶ [0043]).
- Maughan discloses two vertical members, where each vertical member has a top end and a bottom end, where the top end is configured to suspend the dip exercise apparatus from a chin-up apparatus, where the bottom end has a bottom grip, where the bottom grip can be rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration, and a bottom grip biasing mechanism that biases the bottom grip to the exercise configuration. (Maughan ¶ [0043], [0050], [0053]).
- Maughan discloses a horizontal connecting member configured to keep the two vertical members spaced apart at a predefined distance, in the exercise configuration the bottom grips are substantially perpendicular to the two vertical members and the horizontal connecting member and when suspended can be used to do dip exercises, and in the flat configuration the bottom grips and the horizontal connecting member are substantially parallel. (Maughan ¶ [0050]).

45. In light of the above cited prior art, Plaintiffs seek a judgment declaring that at least claims 1-2, 5-6, 10, 12, 15, and 18 of the '752 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**CLAIM II: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT
OF THE '752 PATENT**

46. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

47. Since the '752 Patent is invalid for failing to comply with at least the condition of patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C § 102, it is axiomatic that Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the '752 Patent. *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 632 (2015) (stating that it is axiomatic that one cannot infringe an invalid patent because there is nothing to infringe upon).

48. Even so, Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the '752 Patent because they do not practice every claimed limitation of at least independent claims 1, 5, and 12.

49. The claims of the '752 Patent are directed to a foldable exercise device. Plaintiffs' workout equipment products are simply not foldable. Additionally, claim 12 further requires a dip exercise apparatus suspended from a distinct chin-up exercise apparatus, which Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not have.

50. For example, claim 1 recites a flat configuration and an exercise configuration, specifically the limitations "where the bottom grip can be rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration." Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not have a bottom grip rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration. There is no rotation capable. Likewise, Plaintiffs' workout equipment products thus do not meet the limitation and "in the flat configuration the bottom grips and the horizontal connecting member are substantially parallel."

51. Similarly, claim 5 recites “a parallel chin-up handle that rotate on the connecting member from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration.” Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products do not rotate from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration and therefore can also not meet the limitation “in the flat configuration the door header hooks, the parallel chin-up handles, the two connecting members, the top horizontal member and the bottom horizontal member are substantially coplanar.”

52. Similarly, claim 12 requires “a parallel chin-up handle that rotate on the connecting member from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration” as well as “where the bottom grip can be rotated from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration” Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products do not rotate from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration and as such also does not meet the limitation “in the flat configuration the bottom grips and the horizontal connecting member are substantially parallel.”

53. Furthermore, claim 12 also requires both “a chin-up exercise apparatus” having a “top horizontal member and a bottom horizontal member connected by two connecting members” and a separate and distinct “dip exercise apparatus suspended from the chin-up exercise apparatus, where the dip exercise apparatus has two vertical members...” The vertical members of Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products cannot also satisfy the separate “connecting members” as claimed.

54. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, Plaintiffs seek a judicial declaration that Plaintiffs’ workout equipment products to not infringe the ‘752 Patent because the ‘752 Patent is invalid and/or because Plaintiffs’ exercise equipment products do not meet every limitation of the independent claims.

CLAIM III: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE ‘746 PATENT

55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

56. Claims 1-6, and 14-18 of the '746 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of Chinese Patent No. CN207187019 entitled "Chin-Up Fitness Equipment on a Door" to Chen *et al.* ("Chen"). Chen was published on April 6, 2018. Exhibit H, the Chen Patent.

57. For example, exemplary claim 1 is invalid as anticipated by Chen because Chen teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Chen discloses a foldable chin-up exercise device. (Chen ¶ [0002]).
- Chen discloses a horizontal member and two connecting members extending from the horizontal member, where the two connecting members are in the same plane and each connecting member has a door header hook and parallel chin-up handle that rotate on the connecting member from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration, where the door header hook and parallel chin-up handle are on opposite sides of the two connecting members, in the exercise configuration the chin-up exercise apparatus can releasably engage a door frame with the door header hook engaging with a door frame header and the parallel chin-up handles can be used to do neutral chin-ups. (Chen ¶ [0028], [0029], [0010], [0033]).

58. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 14-15, and 17-18 of the '746 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of U.K. Patent Application Publication No. GB2472242 entitled "Chin-up bar" to Spence ("Spence"). Spence was published April 20, 2011. Exhibit I, the Spence Patent App.

59. For example, exemplary claim 1 is invalid as anticipated by Spence because Spence teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Spence discloses a foldable chin-up exercise device. (Spence pg. 1).
- Spence discloses a horizontal member and two connecting members extending from the horizontal member, where the two connecting members are in the same plane and each connecting member has a door header hook and parallel chin-up handle that rotate on the connecting member from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration, where the door header hook and parallel chin-up handle are on opposite sides of the two connecting members, in the exercise configuration the chin-up exercise apparatus can releasably engage a door frame with the door header hook engaging with a door frame header and the parallel chin-up handles can be used to do neutral chin-ups. (Spence pg. 1 and Figures).

60. Claim 8 of the '746 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least in light of South Korean Patent Application No. KR20130093219 entitled "Pull-up Bar" to Kim ("Kim"). Kim was published February 14, 2012. Exhibit J, the Kim Patent App.

61. For example, exemplary claim 8 is invalid as anticipated by Kim because Kim teaches and/or discloses each and every limitation in that claim:

- To the extent the preamble is limiting, Kim discloses a chin-up exercise device. (Kim pg. 3).
- Kim discloses a top horizontal member. (Kim pg. 3).
- Kim discloses a bottom horizontal member spaced apart from the top horizontal member. (Kim pg. 3).

- Kim discloses two connecting members connecting the top horizontal member and the bottom horizontal member, where each connecting member has a door header hook and a parallel chin-up handle that transitions to an exercise configuration, where the door header hook and the parallel chin-up handle are on opposite sides of the connecting members, in the exercise configuration the door header hooks and parallel chin-up handles are roughly perpendicular to the bottom horizontal member and the chin-up apparatus can releasably engage a door frame with the bottom horizontal member pressing against a front of vertical door jams and with the door header hook engaged with a back side of door frame header and the parallel chin-up handles extend away from the door frame parallel to each other and the parallel chin-up handles are available for neutral chin-ups. (Kim pg. 3).

62. In light of the above cited prior art, Plaintiffs seek a judgment declaring that at least claims 16, 8, 14-18 of the '746 Patent are invalid as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**CLAIM IV: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT
OF THE '746 PATENT**

63. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

64. Since the '746 Patent is invalid for failing to comply with at least the condition of patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C § 102, it is axiomatic that Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the '746 Patent. *Commil USA, LLC v. Cisco Sys., Inc.*, 575 U.S. 632 (2015) (stating that it is axiomatic that one cannot infringe an invalid patent because there is nothing to infringe upon).

65. Even so, Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the '746 Patent because they do not practice every claimed limitation of at least independent claims 1, 8, and 14.

66. The claims of the '746 Patent are directed to a foldable chin-up exercise device. Plaintiffs' workout equipment products are simply not foldable.

67. For example, claim 1 recites a flat configuration and an exercise configuration, specifically the limitations "...each connecting member has a door header hook and parallel chin-up handle that rotate on the connecting member from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration..." Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not have a door header hook and parallel chin-up handle that rotate from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration. There is no rotation capable.

68. Similarly, claims 8 and 14 recite "where each connecting member has a door header hook and a parallel chin-up handle that transitions to an exercise configuration." Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not transition from a flat configuration to an exercise configuration.

69. Similarly, claim 14 requires "in the flat configuration the door header hooks, the parallel chin-up handles, the connecting member and the horizontal member are substantially coplanar." Plaintiffs' workout equipment products comprises members which are not coplanar in the flat configuration.

70. Pursuant to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, Plaintiff seeks a judicial declaration that Plaintiffs' exercise equipment products do not infringe the '746 Patent because the '746 Patent is invalid and/or because Plaintiff's exercise equipment products do not meet every limitation of the independent claims.

CLAIM V: TORTIOUS INTERFERENE WITH CONTRACT

71. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

72. Plaintiffs and Amazon have valid and enforceable contractual relationships via the Amazon Services Business Solutions Agreement in which Plaintiffs were permitted to sell goods on the Amazon marketplace in exchange for fees.

73. Defendant was aware of Plaintiffs' contractual agreement with Amazon as he knew Plaintiffs offered products under the Amazon storefront herein identified.

74. Defendant intentionally and unjustifiably induced Amazon to breach the agreements with Plaintiffs by filing bad faith Amazon Infringement Complaints with knowledge that the '472 Patent is not infringed by Plaintiffs' workout equipment products.

75. Amazon did in fact breach the agreements with Plaintiffs as a result, thereby removing Plaintiffs' products from the Amazon marketplace.

76. Defendant's actions have caused economic and financial harm to Plaintiffs in largely unquantifiable amounts.

**CLAIM VI: TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE BUSINESS
EXPECTANCY**

77. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

78. Plaintiffs had a reasonable expectation of entering into valid business relationships with Amazon and with the consuming public via the Amazon storefronts identified herein.

79. Defendant was fully aware of Plaintiffs' expectation as he knew Plaintiffs sold products on the Amazon platform, as shown by his objectively false Amazon Infringement Complaints.

80. Defendant purposefully interfered with Plaintiffs' prospective business relationships by filing bad faith Amazon Infringement Complaints with knowledge that '472 Patent is not infringed by Plaintiffs' workout equipment products.

81. As a result of Defendant's false Amazon Infringement Complaints, Amazon removed Plaintiffs' products from the Amazon marketplace, thereby causing economic and financial harm to Plaintiffs in largely unquantifiable amounts.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requests a trial by jury of any issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment as follows:

- a. a declaration that the Patents-in-Suit are invalid;
- b. a declaration that Plaintiffs' workout equipment products do not infringe the Patents-in-Suit;
- c. a judgment that Defendant has tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs' contractual relations;
- d. a judgment that Defendant has tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs' prospective business relationships;
- e. a declaration that this case is exceptional and an award to Plaintiffs of its costs, expenses, and reasonable attorney fees incurred in this action pursuant to 35 U.S.C § 285; and
- f. Further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: December 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Hao Ni
Hao Ni
Texas Bar No.: 24047205
Ni, Wang & Massand, PLLC

8140 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 500
Dallas, TX 75231
972.331.4600
972.314.0900 (facsimile)
hni@nilawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF