

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
MANHATTAN DIVISION**

**LINFO IP, LLC,
Plaintiff,**

v.

**AMERICAN EXCHANGE APPAREL
GROUP, CORP.,
Defendant**

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-02952

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PLAINTIFF’S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Linfo IP, LLC (“Linfo”) files this Original Complaint and demand for jury trial seeking relief from patent infringement of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 9,092,428 (“the ’428 patent”) (referred to as the “Patent-in-Suit”) by American Exchange Apparel Group, Corp. (“Defendant” or “Aero”).

I. THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff, Linfo IP, LLC, is a Texas limited liability corporation with its principal place of business located in Austin, Texas.

2. On information and belief, Defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of DE, with a regular and established place of business located at 1400 Broadway, 18th Floor, New York, New York, 10018. On information and belief, Defendant sells and offers to sell products and services throughout New York, including in this judicial district, and introduces products and services that perform infringing methods or processes into the stream of commerce knowing that they would be sold in New York and this judicial district. Defendant can be served with process through their registered agent, at its place of business, The Corporation,

152 West 36th Street, Suite 401, New York, New York 10018, or anywhere else it may be found. In 2023, American Exchange Group acquired Aerosole.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has original subject-matter jurisdiction over the entire action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a) because Plaintiff’s claim arises under an Act of Congress relating to patents, namely, 35 U.S.C. § 271.

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because: (i) Defendant is present within or has minimum contacts within the State of New York and this judicial district; (ii) Defendant has purposefully availed itself of the privileges of conducting business in the State of New York and in this judicial district; and (iii) Plaintiff’s cause of action arises directly from Defendant’s business contacts and other activities in the State of New York and in this judicial district.

5. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(b). Defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular and established place of business in this District. Further, venue is proper because Defendant conducts substantial business in this forum, directly or through intermediaries, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein; and (ii) regularly doing or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct and/or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in New York and this District.

III. INFRINGEMENT

A. Infringement of the ’428 Patent

6. On July 28, 2015, U.S. Patent No. 9,092,428 (“the ’428 patent”, included as Exhibit A and part of this complaint) entitled “System, methods and user interface for discovering and presenting

information in text content” was duly and legally issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Plaintiff owns the ’428 patent by assignment.

7. The ’428 patent relates to system and methods for discovering information in a text content, and provides users with interface objects to act on the discovered information, such as extracting, displaying or hiding, or highlighting or un-highlighting words or phrases in a text content.

8. Defendant maintains, operates, and administers a system with methods and user interface for discovering information in a text content and extracting and presenting the information that infringes one or more of claims of the ’428 patent, including one or more of claims 1-20, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Defendant puts the inventions claimed by the ’428 Patent into service (i.e., used them); but for Defendant’s actions, the claimed-inventions embodiments involving Defendant’s products and services would never have been put into service. Defendant’s acts complained of herein caused those claimed-invention embodiments as a whole to perform, and Defendant’s procurement of monetary and commercial benefit from it.

9. Support for the allegations of infringement may be found in the preliminary exemplary table attached as Exhibit B. These allegations of infringement are preliminary and are therefore subject to change.

10. Defendant has and continues to induce infringement. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., discovering information in a text content and extracting and presenting the information) such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-20 of the ’428 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover,

Defendant has known of the '428 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.¹ For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

11. Defendant has and continues to contributorily infringe. Defendant has actively encouraged or instructed others (e.g., its customers and/or the customers of its related companies), and continues to do so, on how to use its products and services (e.g., discovering information in a text content and extracting and presenting the information) and related services such as to cause infringement of one or more of claims 1-20 of the '428 patent, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Moreover, Defendant has known of the '428 patent and the technology underlying it from at least the filing date of the lawsuit.² For clarity, direct infringement is previously alleged in this complaint.

12. Defendant has caused and will continue to cause Plaintiff damage by direct and indirect infringement of (including inducing infringement of) the claims of the '428 patent.

IV. CONDITIONS PRECEDENT

13. Plaintiff is a non-practicing entity, with no products to mark. Plaintiff has pled all statutory requirements to obtain pre-suit damages. Further, all conditions precedent to recovery are met.

V. JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on issues so triable by right.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:

- a. enter judgment that Defendant has infringed the claims of the '428 patent;

¹ Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

² Plaintiff reserves the right to amend if discovery reveals an earlier date of knowledge.

- b. award Plaintiff damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for Defendant's infringement of the Patent-in-suit in an amount no less than a reasonable royalty or lost profits, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- c. award Plaintiff an accounting for acts of infringement not presented at trial and an award by the Court of additional damage for any such acts of infringement;
- d. declare this case to be "exceptional" under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Plaintiff its attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action;
- e. declare Defendant's post lawsuit infringement to be willful and treble the damages, including attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action and an increase in the damage award pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- f. a decree addressing future infringement that either (i) awards a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its agents, servants, employees, affiliates, divisions, and subsidiaries, and those in association with Defendant from infringing the claims of the Patent-in-suit, or (ii) awards damages for future infringement in lieu of an injunction in an amount consistent with the fact that for future infringement the Defendant will be an adjudicated infringer of a valid patent, and trebles that amount in view of the fact that the future infringement will be willful as a matter of law; and,
- g. a decree addressing future infringement that either (i) awards a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its agents, servants, employees, affiliates, divisions, and subsidiaries, and those in association with Defendant from infringing the claims of the Patent-in-suit, or (ii) awards damages for future infringement in lieu of an injunction in an amount consistent with the fact that for future infringement the Defendant will be an

adjudicated infringer of a valid patent, and trebles that amount in view of the fact that the future infringement will be willful as a matter of law; and

- h. award Plaintiff such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David J. Hoffman

David J. Hoffman
254 W 15th St., Apt. 2C
New York, New York 10011
(917) 701-3117 (telephone)
djhoffman@djhoffmanlaw.com

&

Ramey LLP

/s/ William P. Ramey, III

William P. Ramey, III (Pro Hac Vice anticipated)
Texas State Bar No. 24027643

5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 800
Houston, Texas 77006
(713) 426-3923 (telephone)
(832) 900-4941 (fax)
wramey@rameyfirm.com

Attorneys for LINFO IP, LLC.