

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

FLEET CONNECT SOLUTIONS LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

OM DIGITAL SOLUTIONS
CORPORATION and OLYMPUS
CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-01049

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Fleet Connect Solutions LLC (“Fleet Connect”) files this Complaint against Defendants OM Digital Solutions Corporation and Olympus Corporation (“Defendant” or “OM”) alleging, based on its own knowledge as to itself and its own actions, and based on information and belief as to all other matters, as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a patent infringement action to stop Defendant’s infringement of the following United States Patents (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”), issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”):

	Patent No.	Reference
1.	6,549,583	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/6549583
2.	6,633,616	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/6633616
3.	7,058,040	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/7058040
4.	7,260,153	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/7260153
5.	7,656,845	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/7656845

	Patent No.	Reference
6.	7,742,388	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/7742388
7.	8,005,053	https://image-ppubs.uspto.gov/dirsearch-public/print/downloadPdf/8005053

2. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and monetary damages.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff is a limited liability company formed under the laws of Texas with its registered office address located in Austin, Texas.

4. Defendant Olympus Corporation is a corporation organized under the laws of Japan, with its principal place of business located at Shinjuku Monolith, 3-1 Nishi-Shinjuku 2-chome, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 163-0914, Japan. Olympus Corporation may be served with process via its registered agents and via its corporate officers.

5. Defendant OM Digital Solutions Corporation is a corporation organized under the laws of Japan with its principal place of business located at Takakuramachi 49-3, Hachioji-City, Tokyo 192-0033, Japan. OM Digital Solutions Corporation may be served with process via its registered agents and via its corporate officers.

6. On information and belief, effective January 2021, the products accused herein ceased being manufactured, offered for sale, sold and/or imported into the United States by Defendant Olympus Corporation and began to be offered for manufactured, offered for sale, sold and/or imported into the United States by Defendant OM Digital Solutions Corporation. References to the activities of “Defendant” or “OM” shall be to the activities of Olympus Corporation prior to January 2021 and to the activities of OM Digital Solutions Corporation beginning in January 2021 and running to the present date.

7. The parties to this action are properly joined under 35 U.S.C. § 299 because the right

to relief asserted against each of the OM defendants jointly and severally arises out of the same series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making and using of the same products or processes bearing at least the OM brand or that are otherwise made for use with services provided by OM. Additionally, questions of fact common to all defendants will arise in this action.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

9. This is an action for infringement of a United States patent arising under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284–85, among others. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1338(a).

10. Venue is proper as to Lenovo in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c) because the OM defendants are foreign corporations. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because OM has committed acts of infringement in this District and has a regular and established place of business in this District, including, without limitation, through authorized sellers and sales representatives that offer and sell products pertinent to this Complaint through the State of Texas, including in this District, and to consumers throughout this District.

11. Defendant is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal jurisdiction under due process due at least to Defendant’s substantial business in this judicial district, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein and(ii) regularly transacting, doing, and/or soliciting business, engaging in other persistent courses of conduct, or deriving substantial revenue from goods and services provided to individuals in Texas and in this District.

12. Specifically, Defendant intends to do and does business in, has committed acts of infringement in, and continues to commit acts of infringement in this District directly, through

intermediaries, by contributing to and through its inducement of third parties, and offers its products or services, including those accused of infringement here, to customers and potential customers located in this District. Defendant markets, sells, and delivers accused products in this district, and has committed acts of infringement in this District.

13. Defendant commits acts of infringement from this District, including, but not limited to, use of the Accused Products and inducement of third parties to use the Accused Products.

THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS

14. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

15. Defendant uses, causes to be used, provides, supplies, or distributes one or more computing devices, including, but not limited to, OM cameras such as the OM-1, OM-5, OM-D E-M1 MARK III, OM-D E-M10 Mark IV, TG-7, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that comprise substantially similar functionality (collectively, the “Accused Products”).

16. On information and belief, the Accused Products perform wireless communications and methods associated with performing and/or implementing wireless communications including, but not limited to, wireless communications and methods pursuant to various protocols and implementations, including, but not limited to, Bluetooth, IEEE 802.11, and various subsections thereof, including, but not limited to, Bluetooth 4.2, 802.11b/ac/n.

17. Defendant was notified that the Accused Products infringe the Asserted Patents by a letter in February of 2024.

18. For these reasons and the additional reasons detailed below, the Accused Products practice at least one claim of each of the Asserted Patents.

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,549,583

19. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety. For purposes of this Count I, the “Accused Products” include OM cameras such as the OM-1 and OM-D E-M1 MARK III, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that comprise substantially similar functionality.

20. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 6,549,583 (the “’583 patent”) on April 15, 2003, after full and fair examination of Application No. 09/790,429 which was filed February 21, 2001. The ’583 patent is entitled “Optimum Phase Error Metric for OFDM Pilot Tone Tracking in Wireless LAN.”

21. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’583 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’583 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

22. The claims of the ’583 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of preexisting error estimation methods.

23. The written description of the ’583 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

24. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the ’583 patent.

25. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the '583 patent by manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '583 patent. As just one example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performs a method of pilot phase error estimation in an orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) receiver. The method includes determining pilot reference points corresponding to a plurality of pilots of an OFDM preamble waveform; and estimating an aggregate phase error of a subsequent OFDM data symbol relative to the pilot reference points using complex signal measurements corresponding to each of the plurality of pilots of the subsequent OFDM data symbol and the pilot reference points; wherein the estimating step comprises performing a maximum likelihood-based estimation using the complex signal measurements corresponding to each of the plurality of pilots of the subsequent OFDM data symbol and the pilot reference points. *See* '583 Evidence of Use Charts, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

26. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT II: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,633,616

27. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety. For purposes of this Count II, the “Accused Products” include OM cameras such as the OM-1 and OM-D E-M1 MARK III, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that comprise substantially similar functionality.

28. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 6,633,616 (the “’616 patent”) on October 14, 2003, after full and fair examination of Application No. 09/935,081 which was filed August 21, 2001. The ’616 patent is entitled “OFDM Pilot Tone Tracking for Wireless LAN.”

29. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’616 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’616 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

30. The claims of the ’616 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of preexisting error estimation methods.

31. The written description of the ’616 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

32. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the ’616 patent.

33. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the ’616 patent by manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 12 of the ’616 patent. As just one example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performs a method of pilot phase error estimation in an orthogonal frequency

division multiplexed (OFDM) receiver. The method includes determining pilot reference points corresponding to a plurality of pilots of an OFDM preamble waveform; processing, in a parallel path to the determining step, the OFDM preamble waveform with a fast Fourier transform; determining a phase error estimate of a subsequent OFDM symbol relative to the pilot reference points; and processing, in the parallel path to the determining step, the subsequent OFDM symbol with the fast Fourier transform; wherein the determining the phase error estimate step is completed prior to the completion of the processing of the subsequent OFDM symbol with the fast Fourier transform in the parallel path. *See* '616 Evidence of Use Charts attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

34. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT III: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,058,040

35. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

36. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 7,058,040 (the "'040 patent") on June 6, 2006, after full and fair examination of Application No. 09/962,718 which was filed September 21, 2001. The '040 patent is entitled "Channel Interference Reduction."

37. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the '040 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the '040 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

38. The claims of the '040 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include

inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of preexisting data transmission methods.

39. The written description of the '040 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

40. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the '040 patent.

41. Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe the claims of the '040 patent through the end of its term by manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '040 patent through the end of its term. As just one example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performed a method for data transmission over first and second media that overlap in frequency. The method included computing one or more time division multiple access (TDMA) time-slot channels to be shared between the first and second media for data transmission; allocating one or more time-slot channels to the first medium for data transmission; allocating one or more of the remaining time-slot channels to the second medium for data transmission; and dynamically adjusting a number of timeslot channels assigned to one of the first and second media during the data transmission to remain within limits of a desired level of service. *See* '040 Evidence of Use Chart attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

42. Defendant had indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe the '040 patent through the end of its term by inducing others to directly infringe the '040 patent. Defendant has induced and continued to induce customers and end-users, including, but not limited to, Defendant's customers, employees, partners, or contractors, to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '040 patent by providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant has taken active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '040 patent, including, for example, claim 1. Such steps by Defendant included, among other things, advising or directing customers, personnel, contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner. Defendant had been performing these steps, which constitute induced infringement with the knowledge of the '040 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts constitute infringement. Defendant has been aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '040 patent. Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

43. Defendant had indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe by contributing to the infringement of the '040 patent through the end of its term. Defendant has contributed and continued to contribute to the direct infringement of the '040 patent by its customers, personnel, and contractors. The Accused Products have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the '040 patent, including, for example, claim 1. The special features constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '040 patent and are not staple

articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Defendant's contributory infringement of the '040 patent was ongoing through the end of its term.

44. Defendant had knowledge of its infringement of the '040 patent at least as of February of 2024.

45. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has a policy or practice of not reviewing the patents of others, including instructing its employees to not review the patents of others, and thus have been willfully blind of Fleet Connect's patent rights.

46. Defendant's actions were at least objectively reckless as to the risk of infringing a valid patent and this objective risk was either known or should have been known by Defendant.

47. Defendant's infringement of the '040 patent was, had been, and continued to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of Fleet Connect's rights under the '040 patent through the end of its term.

48. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT IV: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,260,153

49. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

50. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 7,260,153 (the "'153 patent") on August 21, 2007, after full and fair examination of Application No. 10/423,447, which was filed on April 28, 2003. The '153 patent is entitled "Multi Input Multi Output Wireless Communication Method and Apparatus Providing Extended Range and Extended Rate Across Imperfectly Estimated

Channels.”

51. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’153 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’153 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

52. The claims of the ’153 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of voice and data communications systems.

53. The written description of the ’153 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

54. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the claims of the ’153 patent by importing, selling, manufacturing, offering to sell, using, providing, supplying, or distributing the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the ’153 patent. As just one example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performs a method for evaluating a channel of a multiple-input multiple-output (“MIMO”) wireless communication system allowing two or more communication devices with multiple radiating elements to transmit parallel data sub-streams which defines a channel matrix metric of cross-talk signal-to-noise (“SNR”) for the sub-streams, estimates the channel matrix metric, performs a singular value decomposition (“SVD”) of the channel matrix metric estimate to calculate estimated

channel singular values, and using the channel matrix metric and estimated channel singular values to calculate a crosstalk measure for the sub-streams. *See* '153 Evidence of Use Charts attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

55. Defendant had also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe the '153 patent through the end of its term by inducing others to directly infringe the '153 patent. Defendant has induced distributors and end-users, including, but not limited to, Defendant's employees, partners, contractors, or customers, to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '153 patent by providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant took active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '153 patent, including, for example, claim 1 of the '153 patent. Such steps by Defendant included, among other things, advising or directing personnel, contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner. Defendant has performed these steps, which constitute induced infringement with the knowledge of the '153 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts constitute infringement. Defendant was aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '153 patent. Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

56. Defendant had also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe by contributing to the infringement of the '153 patent through the end of its term. Defendant has contributed to the direct infringement of the '153 patent by its personnel, contractors, distributors, and customers. The Accused Products have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more

claims of the '153 patent, including, for example, claim 1 of the '153 patent. The special features constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '153 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Defendant's contributory infringement is ongoing.

57. Defendant had knowledge of its infringement of the '153 patent at least as of February of 2024.

58. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has a policy or practice of not reviewing the patents of others, including instructing its employees to not review the patents of others, and thus has been willfully blind of Fleet Connect's patent rights.

59. Defendant's actions were at least objectively reckless as to the risk of infringing a valid patent and this objective risk was either known or should have been known by Defendant.

60. Defendant's direct infringement of the '153 patent was, had been, and continues to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of Fleet Connect's rights under the patent.

61. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the '153 patent.

62. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT V: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,656,845

63. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

64. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 7,656,845 (the “’845 patent”) on February 2, 2010 after full and fair examination of Application No. 11/402,172 which was filed on April 11, 2006. The ’845 patent is entitled “Channel Interference Reduction.” A Certificate of Correction was issued on November 30, 2010.

65. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’845 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’845 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

66. The claims of the ’845 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of preexisting systems and methods of wireless communication with a mobile unit.

67. The written description of the ’845 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

68. Defendant had directly infringed and continued to directly infringe the claims of the ’845 patent through the end of its term by importing, selling, manufacturing, offering to sell, using, providing, supplying, or distributing the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 12 of the ’845 patent through the end of its term. As just one example of infringement, the Accused Products used by Defendant provide a system comprising a processor, a first transceiver configured to communicate *via* a first medium, a second transceiver configured to

communicate *via* a second medium, wherein at least one of the first transceiver and the second transceiver is configured to retry transmission of a packet at a lower rate if a prior transmission of the packet is not acknowledged, an allocation unit configured to dynamically allocate data channels to one of the first medium and the second medium based upon a desired level of service. *See* '845 Evidence of Use Chart attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

69. Defendant had also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe the '845 patent through the end of its term by inducing others to directly infringe the '845 patent. Defendant has induced distributors and end-users, including, but not limited to, Defendant's employees, partners, contractors, or customers, to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '845 patent by providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant took active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '845 patent, including, for example, claim 12 of the '845 patent. Such steps by Defendant included, among other things, advising or directing personnel, contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner. Defendant performed these steps, which constitute induced infringement with the knowledge of the '845 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts constitute infringement. Defendant is aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '845 patent. Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

70. Defendant had also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe by contributing to the infringement of the '845 patent through the end of its term. Defendant has contributed to the direct infringement of the '845 patent by its personnel, contractors, distributors,

and customers. The Accused Products have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the '845 patent, including, for example, claim 12 of the '845 patent. The special features constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '845 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Defendant's contributory infringement of the '845 patent was ongoing through the end of its term.

71. Defendant had knowledge of its infringement of the '845 patent at least as of February of 2024.

72. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has a policy or practice of not reviewing the patents of others, including instructing its employees to not review the patents of others, and thus has been willfully blind of Fleet Connect's patent rights.

73. Defendant's actions are at least objectively reckless as to the risk of infringing a valid patent and this objective risk was either known or should have been known by Defendant.

74. Defendant's direct infringement of the '845 patent was, had been, and continued to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of Fleet Connect's rights under the patent '845 patent through the end of its term.

75. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the '845 patent.

76. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

COUNT VI: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,742,388

77. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

78. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 7,742,388 (the “’388 patent”) on June 22, 2010, after full and fair examination of Application No. 11/185,665 which was filed July 20, 2005. The ’388 patent is entitled “Packet Generation Systems and Methods.”

79. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’388 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’388 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

80. The claims of the ’388 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of preexisting systems and methods of generating packets in a digital communications system.

81. The written description of the ’388 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

82. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the ’388 patent.

83. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the claims of the ’388 patent by manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly

infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '388 patent. As just one example of infringement, Defendant performs a method including generating a packet with a size corresponding to a protocol used for a network transmission, wherein the packet comprises a preamble having a first training symbol and a second training symbol. The method further includes increasing the size of the packet by adding subcarriers to the second training symbol of the packet to produce an extended packet, wherein a quantity of subcarriers of the second training symbol is greater than a quantity of subcarriers of the first training symbol; and transmitting the extended packet from an antenna. *See* '388 Evidence of Use Charts attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.

84. Defendant has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe the '388 patent by inducing others to directly infringe the '388 patent. Defendant has induced and continue to induce customers and end-users, including, but not limited to, Defendant's customers, employees, partners, or contractors, to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '388 patent by providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant has taken active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the '388 patent, including, for example, claim 1. Such steps by Defendant has included, among other things, advising or directing customers, personnel, contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner. Defendant has been performing these steps, which constitute induced infringement with the knowledge of the '388 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts

constitute infringement. Defendant has been aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '388 patent. Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

85. Defendant has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe by contributing to the infringement of the '388 patent. Defendant has contributed and continue to contribute to the direct infringement of the '388 patent by its customers, personnel, and contractors. The Accused Products have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the '388 patent, including, for example, claim 1. The special features constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '388 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use. Defendant's contributory infringement is ongoing.

86. Defendant had knowledge of its infringement of the '388 patent at least as of February of 2024.

87. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has a policy or practice of not reviewing the patents of others, including instructing its employees to not review the patents of others, and thus have been willfully blind of Fleet Connect's patent rights.

88. Defendant's actions are at least objectively reckless as to the risk of infringing a valid patent and this objective risk was either known or should have been known by Defendant.

89. Defendant's infringement of the '388 patent is, has been, and continues to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of Fleet Connect's rights under the patent.

90. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

91. Fleet Connect has suffered irreparable harm, through its loss of market share and goodwill, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. Fleet Connect has and will continue to suffer this harm by virtue of Defendant's infringement of the '388 patent. Defendant's actions have interfered with and will interfere with Fleet Connect's ability to license technology. The balance of hardships favors Fleet Connect's ability to commercialize its own ideas and technology. The public interest in allowing Fleet Connect to enforce its right to exclude outweighs other public interests, which supports injunctive relief in this case.

COUNT VII: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 8,005,053

92. Fleet Connect repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as though fully set forth in their entirety.

93. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 8,005,053 (the "'053 patent") on August 23, 2011, after full and fair examination of Application No. 12/696,760, which was filed on January 29, 2010. The '053 patent is entitled "Channel Interference Reduction."

94. Fleet Connect owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the '053 patent, including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the '053 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

95. The claims of the '053 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and operation of voice and data communications systems.

96. The written description of the '053 patent describes in technical detail each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim limitations is patently distinct from and

improved upon what may have been considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

97. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the '053 patent by importing, selling, manufacturing, offering to sell, using, providing, supplying, or distributing the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 10 of the '053 patent. As just one example of infringement, Defendant performs a method comprising a communication device storing data encoded for a plurality of different wireless protocols, the communication device including a plurality of wireless transceivers, each of which is configured to transmit data according to a corresponding one of the plurality of different wireless protocols where the communication device selects one of the plurality of different wireless protocols and encodes data of an unselected one of the plurality of different wireless protocols into the selected wireless protocol, and transmits the encoded data using the one of the plurality of wireless transceivers corresponding to the selected wireless protocol. *See* '053 Evidence of Use Charts attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

98. Fleet Connect or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for infringement of the '053 patent.

99. Fleet Connect has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to Fleet Connect in an amount that compensates it for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty, together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

JURY DEMAND

100. Fleet Connect hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

101. Fleet Connect requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendant, and that the Court grant Fleet Connect the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of each of the Asserted Patents has been infringed, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, by Defendant or others acting in concert therewith;
- b. A permanent injunction enjoining Defendant and its officers, directors, agents, servants, affiliates, employees, divisions, branches, subsidiaries, parents, and all others acting in concert therewith from infringement of the '388 patent; or, in the alternative, an award of a reasonable ongoing royalty for future infringement of the Asserted Patents by such entities;
- c. Judgment that Defendant account for and pay to Fleet Connect all damages to and costs incurred by Fleet Connect because of Defendant's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- d. Judgment that Defendant's infringements of the '040 patent, the '153 patent, the '845 patent, and the '388 patent be found willful, and that the Court award treble damages for the period of such willful infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- e. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused by Defendant's infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- f. That this Court declare this an exceptional case and award Fleet Connect its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
- g. All other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: December 13, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: */s/ James F. McDonough, III*

Jonathan L. Hardt (TX 24039906)
ROZIER HARDT MCDONOUGH PLLC
712 W. 14th Street, Suite A
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (210) 289-7541
Email: hardt@rhmttrial.com

C. Matthew Rozier (CO 46854)
ROZIER HARDT MCDONOUGH PLLC
1500 K Street, 2nd Floor
Washington, District of Columbia 20005
Telephone: (404) 779-5305; (202) 316-1591
Email: matt@rhmttrial.com

James F. McDonough, III (GA 117088)*
ROZIER HARDT MCDONOUGH PLLC
659 Auburn Avenue NE, Unit 254
Atlanta, Georgia 30312
Telephone: (404) 564-1866
Email: jim@rhmttrial.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff FLEET CONNECT SOLUTIONS LLC

* Admitted to the Eastern District of Texas

Exhibits

- A. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 6,549,583
- B. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 6,633,616
- C. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 7,058,040
- D. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 7,260,153
- E. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 7,656,845
- F. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 7,742,388
- G. Evidence of Use Chart – US Patent No. 8,005,053

Attachments

- Civil Cover Sheet
- Proposed Summons (2)