

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
OWENSBORO DIVISION

FILED
JAMES J. VILT JR,
CLERK
Feb. 20, 2024
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

APPLIED CONCEPTS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MPH INDUSTRIES INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:24cv-22-BJB

APPLIED CONCEPTS, INC.’S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 3 and 7, Plaintiff Applied Concepts, Inc. (“Applied Concepts” or “ACI”), by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby files this Original Complaint (“Complaint”) against MPH Industries Inc. (“MPH”).

NATURE AND BASIS OF THE SUIT

1. This is a civil action for infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,038,614 (“614 Patent”), 7,049,999 (“999 Patent”), 7,057,550 (“550 Patent”), 7,227,494 (“494 Patent”), 7,411,544 (“544 Patent”), 7,672,782 (“782 Patent”), 7,864,102 (“102 Patent”), and 8,138,966 (“966 Patent”) (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”) (attached hereto as Exhibits A–H) arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* and 28 U.S.C. § 271, *et seq.*, and with subject matter jurisdiction afforded to this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

PARTIES

2. ACI is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas with a place of business in Richardson, Dallas County, Texas, which is in Dallas County.

3. MPH is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Kentucky with its principal place of business at 316 East 9th St., Owensboro, Kentucky, which is in Daviess County

and the Owensboro Division of this District.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over these claims pursuant to, and without limitation, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over MPH because it is incorporated under the laws of Kentucky and maintains its principal place of business in this District. Therefore, MPH is subject to the Court's general personal jurisdiction.

6. Further, this Court has personal jurisdiction over MPH because MPH, directly or through its subsidiaries, divisions, groups, employees, representatives, and/or agents has sufficient minimum contacts with this forum as a result of business conducted within the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Further, MPH has committed acts within this District giving rise to this action and has established minimum contacts with this forum such that the exercise of jurisdiction would not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Therefore, MPH is subject to the Court's specific personal jurisdiction.

7. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400 because MPH is incorporated in and maintains its principal office in the District, therefore MPH is a resident for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

8. Further, venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400 because MPH has committed acts of direct and indirect infringement in this District and maintains a regular and established place of business in this District.

9. A substantial part of the ongoing patent infringement giving rise to this Complaint occurred in the Owensboro Division of the Western District of Kentucky, by virtue of MPH's presence and infringing activities in Owensboro, Kentucky.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

A. ACI and the Patents-in-Suit

10. ACI began as a small contract engineering and manufacturing business in 1975 and is the technology leader in the field of speed detection radar, as well as light detection and ranging (Lidar) speed detection equipment, video law enforcement equipment and numerous other types of equipment used by safety officers to protect the public. MPH has access to the products of ACI because the customers of these products are public safety departments of cities, states and municipalities, such that MPH has become aware of all of the patented innovations of ACI. In addition, because public safety departments of cities, states and municipalities often issue bid requisitions for equipment and make the responses public, MPH has been able to access product manuals of ACI. MPH routinely copies features of ACI's products, which are marked with ACI's patent numbers.

11. On May 2, 2006, the '614 Patent, entitled "Vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '614 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '614 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '614 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.

12. Prior to the filing of the '614 Patent, the need to perform quadrature demodulation on reflected modulated FM signals and to determine a range measurement based upon phase angle measurements derived therefrom was not widely recognized. Claim 1 of the '614 Patent recites:

A vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system, the system comprising:
a modulation circuit portion for generating modulated FM signals;
an antenna circuit portion for transmitting the modulated FM signals to a target and receiving reflected modulated FM signals therefrom; and

a ranging circuit portion for performing a quadrature demodulation on the reflected modulated FM signals and determining a range measurement based upon phase angle measurements derived therefrom.

13. On May 23, 2006, the '999 Patent, entitled "Modular circuit for a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '999 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '999 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '999 Patent is attached as Exhibit B.

14. Prior to the filing of the '999 Patent, the need for a modulation circuit comprising a varactor device positioned within a cavity of an oscillator for tuning a double-modulated FM signal generated by the oscillator was not widely recognized. Claim 13 of the '999 Patent recites:

A modulation circuit for a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system, the modulation circuit comprising:

a digital-to-analog convertor for converting a plurality of digital inputs to a convertor voltage output; and

a varactor device positioned within a cavity of an oscillator, the varactor device, responsive to the convertor voltage output, for tuning a double-modulated FM signal generated by the oscillator.

15. On June 6, 2006, the '550 Patent, entitled "System and method for calibrating a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '550 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '550 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '550 Patent is attached as Exhibit C.

16. Prior to the filing of the '550 Patent, the need for a calibration circuit that determines a calibration signal by comparing a first range measurement derived from phase angle measurements associated with reflected modulated FM signals and a second range measurement derived from speed and time measurements associated with the reflected modulated FM signals was not widely recognized. Claim 1 of the '550 Patent recites:

A system for calibrating a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar, the system comprising:

a modulation circuit portion for generating modulated FM signals;

an antenna circuit portion for transmitting the modulated FM signals to a target and receiving reflected modulated FM signals therefrom; and

a calibration circuit portion, responsive to the reflected modulated FM signals, for determining a calibration signal and sending the calibration signal to the modulation circuit portion, where the calibration circuit portion determines the calibration signal by comparing a first range measurement derived from phase angle measurements associated with the reflected modulated FM signals and a second range measurement derived from speed and time measurements associated with the reflected modulated FM signals.

17. On June 5, 2007, the '494 Patent, entitled "Vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '494 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '494 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '494 Patent is attached as Exhibit D.

18. Prior to the filing of the '494 Patent, the need to use speed detection radar range

and velocity to assess a risk of collision was not widely recognized. Claim 1 of the '494 Patent recites:

A vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system, the system comprising:
a source vehicle having a direction-sensing Doppler radar; and
a target vehicle having a speed and a range, the speed of the target vehicle being determined independently of a velocity of the source vehicle and the range of the target vehicle being measured with respect to the source vehicle,
wherein the direction-sensing Doppler radar is operable to determine the speed and the range and, based thereupon, assess a risk of collision between the source vehicle and the target vehicle.

19. On August 12, 2008, the '544 Patent, entitled "System and method for determining patrol speed," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '544 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '544 Patent is valid and enforceable through its expiration date of January 2, 2022. A true copy of the '544 Patent is attached as Exhibit E.

20. Prior to the filing of the '544 Patent, the need to simultaneously process vehicle speeds in front of the patrol vehicle and behind the patrol vehicle was not widely recognized. Claim 1 of the '544 Patent recites:

A system for processing vehicle speed data for a vehicle comprising:
a front antenna assembly of the vehicle generating a front digital signal;
a rear antenna assembly of the vehicle generating a rear digital signal; and
a patrol vehicle speed system receiving the front digital signal and the rear digital

signal and generating a vehicle speed for the patrol vehicle from the front digital signal and the rear digital signal and at least one additional vehicle speed for an observed vehicle other than the patrol vehicle.

21. On March 2, 2010, the '782 Patent, entitled "Traffic alert police radar," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '782 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '782 Patent is valid and enforceable through its expiration date of October 17, 2023. A true copy of the '782 Patent is attached as Exhibit F.

22. Prior to the filing of the '782 Patent, the need to use Doppler radar to detect and warn of the potential collision of a closing vehicle with a primary vehicle was not widely recognized. Claim 20 of the '782 Patent recites:

A system of warning the operator of a primary vehicle about the potential collision of a closing vehicle with the primary vehicle, the closing vehicle proceeding in the same direction as the primary vehicle, the system comprising:

a police Doppler direction sensing radar for determining one or more parameters about the state of the movement of the closing vehicle;

a primary vehicle speed sensing component associated with the police Doppler direction sensing radar, the primary vehicle speed sensing component for determining the pattern of speed variations of the primary vehicle during a predetermined time interval;

a controller associated with the police Doppler direction sensing radar, the controller for determining the state of the transmission setting of the primary vehicle during the predetermined time interval; and

a user interface for generating an alert to the operator of the primary vehicle when (1) the pattern corresponds to a predetermined pattern indicative of a particular driving maneuver and (2) the one or more parameters of the state of movement of the closing vehicle are at a predetermined status,

wherein the predetermined status of one or more parameters of the state of movement of the closing vehicle includes a status selected from the group consisting of exceeding a maximum closing vehicle speed, exceeding a maximum difference in speed between the primary vehicle and the closing vehicle, failing to meet a minimum range from the primary vehicle to the closing vehicle, and failing to meet a minimum time to collision.

23. On January 4, 2011, the '102 Patent, entitled "Vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '102 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '102 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '102 Patent is attached as Exhibit G.

24. Prior to the filing of the '102 Patent, the need to use frequency signal differentials associated with a target spectrum to determine respective speeds of two vehicles and to analyze phase angle signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective ranges of two vehicles was not widely recognized. Claim 11 of the '102 Patent recites:

A method for operating a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar, the method comprising:

transmitting modulated FM signals from a Doppler radar to first and second targets;
receiving first reflected modulated FM signals at the Doppler radar from the first

target;

receiving second reflected modulated FM signals at the Doppler radar from the second target;

transforming the received first and second reflected modulated FM signals to target spectrum;

analyzing frequency signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective speeds of the first and second targets; and

analyzing phase angle signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective ranges of the first and second targets.

25. On March 20, 2012, the '966 Patent, entitled "Vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar system," was duly and lawfully issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. ACI is the owner by assignment of all right, title, and interest in and to the '966 Patent, including all right to recover for any and all infringement thereof. The '966 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true copy of the '966 Patent is attached as Exhibit H.

26. Prior to the filing of the '966 Patent, the need to use frequency signal differentials associated with a target spectrum to determine respective speeds of two vehicles and to analyze phase angle signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective ranges of two vehicles was not widely recognized. Claim 9 of the '966 Patent recites:

A method for operating a vehicular traffic surveillance Doppler radar, the method comprising:

receiving first reflected modulated FM signals at the Doppler radar from a first target;

receiving second reflected modulated FM signals at the Doppler radar from a

second target;

transforming the received first and second reflected modulated FM signals to target spectrum;

analyzing frequency signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective speeds of the first and second targets; and

analyzing phase angle signal differentials associated with the target spectrum to determine respective ranges of the first and second targets.

B. MPH and the Accused Products

27. MPH is a competitor in the speed detection radar market. MPH sells its competing speed detection radar units and accessories using the “Ranger EZ” trade name (the “Ranger EZ Radar Product”) and the “Python III” trade name (the “Python III Radar Product”).

28. MPH sells, offers for sale and, on information and belief, makes, uses and imports the Ranger EZ Radar Product which practices every limitation of one or more claims of the ’614, ’999, ’550, ’494, ’782, ’102, and ’966 Patents and the Python III Radar Product which practices every limitation of at least one or more claims of the ’544 Patent. Attached hereto are Exhibits I–P which include evidence of MPH’s infringement and claim charts showing how the identified exemplary claims are infringed due to the Ranger EZ Radar Product and the Python III Radar Product.

COUNT I
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,038,614

29. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI’s Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

30. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the ’614 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and

recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '614 Patent.

31. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

32. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '614 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit I.

33. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '614 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

34. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

35. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '614 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

36. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

37. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '614 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '614 Patent.

38. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

39. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

40. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT II
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,038,614

41. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

42. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '614 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '614 Patent.

43. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

44. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

45. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the

Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

46. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '614 Patent as recited herein.

47. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '614 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '614 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

48. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

49. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '614 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

50. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least

claim 1 of the '614 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

51. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '614 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '614 Patent.

52. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 1 of the '614 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

53. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

54. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT III
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,049,999

55. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

56. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '999 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '999 Patent.

57. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

58. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 13 of the

'999 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit J.

59. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '999 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

60. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

61. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '999 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

62. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

63. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '999 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '999 Patent.

64. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

65. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales

of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

66. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT IV
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,049,999

67. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

68. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '999 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '999 Patent.

69. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

70. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

71. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

72. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 13 of the '999 Patent

as recited herein.

73. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '999 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '999 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

74. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

75. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '999 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

76. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 13 of the '999 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

77. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '999 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '999 Patent.

78. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 13 of the

'999 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

79. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

80. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT V
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,057,550

81. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

82. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '550 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '550 Patent.

83. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

84. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '550 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit K.

85. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '550 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

86. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in

its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

87. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '550 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

88. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

89. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '550 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '550 Patent.

90. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

91. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

92. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT VI
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,057,550

93. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as

though set forth fully herein.

94. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '550 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '550 Patent.

95. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

96. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

97. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

98. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '550 Patent as recited herein.

99. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '550 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '550 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

100. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has

been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

101. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '550 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

102. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

103. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '550 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '550 Patent.

104. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 1 of the '550 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

105. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary

products.

106. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT VII
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,227,494

107. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

108. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '494 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '494 Patent.

109. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

110. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '494 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit L.

111. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '494 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

112. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

113. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH

will continue to infringe the '494 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

114. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

115. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '494 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '494 Patent.

116. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

117. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

118. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT VIII
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,227,494

119. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

120. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '494 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '494 Patent.

121. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce

infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

122. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

123. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

124. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '494 Patent as recited herein.

125. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '494 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '494 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

126. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

127. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI

irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '494 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

128. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

129. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '494 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '494 Patent.

130. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 1 of the '494 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

131. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

132. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT IX
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,411,544

133. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as

though set forth fully herein.

134. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '544 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '544 Patent.

135. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Python III Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

136. The Python III Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '544 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit M.

137. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '544 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

138. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

139. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '544 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

140. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Python III Radar Product infringes at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

141. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '544 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '544 Patent.

142. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

143. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Python III Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

144. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT X
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,411,544

145. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

146. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '544 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '544 Patent.

147. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Python III Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

148. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to

sell, and/or importing the Python III Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

149. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Python III Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

150. The Python III Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 1 of the '544 Patent as recited herein.

151. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '544 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '544 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

152. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

153. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '544 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

154. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Python III Radar Product in

combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Python III Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

155. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '544 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '544 Patent.

156. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 1 of the '544 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

157. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

158. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XI
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,672,782

159. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

160. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '782 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '782 Patent.

161. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at

least claim 20 of the '782 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

162. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 20 of the '782 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit N.

163. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '782 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

164. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

165. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '782 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

166. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

167. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '782 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '782 Patent.

168. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and

seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

169. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

170. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XII
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,672,782

171. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

172. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '782 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '782 Patent.

173. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

174. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

175. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of

commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

176. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 20 of the '782 Patent as recited herein.

177. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '782 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '782 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

178. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

179. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '782 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

180. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

181. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '782

Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '782 Patent.

182. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 20 of the '782 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

183. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

184. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XIII
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,864,102

185. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

186. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '102 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '102 Patent.

187. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

188. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 11 of the '102 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit O.

189. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '102 Patent pursuant to 35

U.S.C. § 271(a).

190. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

191. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '102 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

192. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

193. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '102 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '102 Patent.

194. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

195. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

196. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of

damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XIV
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,864,102

197. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

198. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '102 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '102 Patent.

199. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

200. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

201. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

202. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 11 of the '102 Patent as recited herein.

203. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '102 Patent

pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '102 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

204. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

205. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '102 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

206. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

207. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '102 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '102 Patent.

208. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 11 of the '102 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

209. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

210. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XV
DIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,138,966

211. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

212. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '966 Patent, with ownership of all substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '966 Patent.

213. On information and belief, MPH has directly infringed and continues to infringe at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent by, among other things, making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a traffic radar speed detection unit.

214. The Ranger EZ Radar Product practices at least every element of claim 9 of the '966 Patent as recited herein, and as shown in Exhibit P.

215. MPH is therefore liable for direct infringement of the '966 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).

216. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for

such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

217. MPH's infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to infringe the '966 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further infringement.

218. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its Ranger EZ Radar Product infringes at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

219. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '966 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '966 Patent.

220. On information and belief, MPH's infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

221. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

222. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT XVI
INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,138,966

223. ACI incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of ACI's Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

224. ACI is the owner by recorded assignment of the '966 Patent, with ownership of all

substantial rights therein, including the right to exclude others, to grant licenses, and to sue and recover damages and seek injunctive relief for past and future infringement of the '966 Patent.

225. On information and belief, MPH has induced infringement and continues to induce infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, providing direction or instructions to users and customers, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

226. On information and belief, MPH has contributed to and continues to contribute to the infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent by, among other things, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use in combination with traffic radar speed detection units.

227. On information and belief, MPH has sold, offered to sell, and/or imported the Ranger EZ Radar Product knowing the same to be especially made or especially adapted for use in infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent, and not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.

228. The Ranger EZ Radar Product, used in combination with or as a component of traffic radar speed detection units, practices at least every element of claim 9 of the '966 Patent as recited herein.

229. MPH is therefore is therefore liable for inducing infringement of the '966 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and/or contributing to the infringement of the '966 Patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

230. As a direct and proximate consequence of MPH's indirect infringement, ACI has been, is being, and, unless such acts and practices are enjoined by the Court, will continue to be injured in its business and property rights, and has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer

injury and damages for which it is entitled to relief under 35 U.S.C. § 284 adequate to compensate for such infringement, including lost profits, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

231. MPH's indirect infringement is further causing and will continue to cause ACI irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Unless and until enjoined by this Court, MPH will continue to indirectly infringe the '966 Patent. Under 35 U.S.C. § 283, ACI is entitled to an injunction against further indirect infringement.

232. Additionally, MPH has received notice and, upon information and belief, knows and has known that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product in combination with traffic radar speed detection units induces infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent and that its sale, offer for sale, and/or importation of the Ranger EZ Radar Product for use as a component of traffic radar speed detection units contributes to the infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent, at least as of the date of receipt of this Complaint.

233. On information and belief, MPH has made no attempt to design around the '966 Patent and has copied the ACI Products. MPH's indirect infringement was undertaken willfully and without permission or license to use the '966 Patent.

234. On information and belief, MPH's indirect infringement of at least claim 9 of the '966 Patent has been willful. ACI has been damaged as the result of MPH's willful indirect infringement and seeks increased damages, up to and including treble damages.

235. ACI is entitled to and claims all damages allowable by law, including injunctive relief, adequate compensation for the indirect infringement, costs, interest, attorney fees, and for the sales of infringing Ranger EZ Radar Product as well as the sales of accessory/ancillary products.

236. ACI further seeks a declaration that it is entitled to three times the amount of

damages found or assessed pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Applied Concepts requests that the Court enter a judgment in Applied Concepts' favor and grant the following relief:

(a) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '614 Patent;

(b) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '614 Patent;

(c) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '999 Patent;

(d) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '999 Patent;

(e) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '550 Patent;

(f) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '550 Patent;

(g) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '494 Patent;

(h) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '494 Patent;

(i) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '544 Patent;

(j) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '544 Patent;

(k) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '782 Patent;

(l) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '782 Patent;

(m) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '102 Patent;

(n) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '102 Patent;

(o) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has directly infringed the '966 Patent;

(p) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts that MPH has indirectly infringed the '966 Patent;

(q) A preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction enjoining MPH, its officers, directors, agents, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in active concert or privity therewith from directly or indirectly infringing the Patents-in-Suit pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 283;

(r) Judgment in favor of Applied Concepts for all damages it has suffered as a result of MPH's direct, indirect, and willful infringement, including lost profits, costs and expenses, together with pre- and post-judgment interest thereon, and all other damages permitted under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including enhanced damages up to three times the amount of damages found or measured and costs, and in any event an amount no less than a reasonable royalty;

(s) An order declaring that Applied Concepts is the prevailing party and that this is an exceptional case, awarding Applied Concepts its reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285

and all other applicable statutes, rules, and common law;

(t) An order awarding Applied Concepts its costs and expenses of litigation, including but not limited to disbursements and expert witness fees; and

(u) Granting such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

In accordance with Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Applied Concepts respectfully demands a jury trial of all issues triable to a jury in this action.

Date: February 16, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Wasif H. Qureshi

Wasif H. Qureshi

Admission pro hac vice pending

wqureshi@jw.com

JACKSON WALKER LLP

1401 McKinney, Suite 1900

Houston, Texas 77010

Telephone: (713) 752-4521

Fax: (713) 752-4221

Christopher J. Rourk

Admission pro hac vice pending

crourk@jw.com

William T. Nilsson

Admission pro hac vice to be submitted

wnilsson@jw.com

JACKSON WALKER LLP

2323 Ross Ave., Suite 600

Dallas, Texas 75201

Telephone: (214) 953-6000

Fax: (214) 953-5822

**COUNSEL FOR APPLIED CONCEPTS,
INC.**