

1 Travis E. Lynch (SBN 335684)
lynch@rhmttrial.com
2 **ROZIER HARDT McDONOUGH PLLC**
659 Auburn Ave. NE, Suite 254
3 Atlanta, Georgia 30312
Telephone: (404) 564-1862

4 *Attorney(s) for Plaintiff Fleet Connect Solutions, LLC*

5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

7 FLEET CONNECT SOLUTIONS LLC,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 LANTRONIX, INC.,

11 Defendant.

Case No. 8:25-cv-00054

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Fleet Connect Solutions LLC (“FCS”) files this Complaint against Lantronix, Inc. (“Lantronix” or “Defendant”) 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
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 a registered office address located in Austin, Texas.

4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Lantronix is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware with a principal place of business located at 535 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, California, 92618.

5. Lantronix can be served at its registered agent, Telos Legal Corp., at 12 West Main Street, P.O. Box 953, Felton, Delaware, 19943.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though

rhm. ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 fully set forth in their entirety.

2 7. This is an action for infringement of a United States patent arising under
3 35 U.S.C. §§ 271, 281, and 284–85, among others. This Court has subject matter
4 jurisdiction of the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1338(a).

5 8. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(d) and
6 1400(b) because Lantronix resides in this district, has its principal place of business
7 in this district, has conducted and continues to conduct business in this district, and
8 has committed and continues to commit acts of infringement in this district.

9 9. Defendant is subject to this Court’s specific and general personal
10 jurisdiction under due process due at least to Defendant’s substantial business in this
11 judicial district, including: (i) at least a portion of the infringements alleged herein;
12 (ii) regularly transacting, doing, and/or soliciting business, engaging in other
13 persistent courses of conduct, or deriving substantial revenue from goods and
14 services provided to individuals in California and in this District; and (iii) having an
15 interest in, using or possessing real property in California.

16 10. Specifically, Defendant intends to do and does business in, has committed
17 acts of infringement in, and continues to commit acts of infringement in this District
18 directly, through intermediaries, by contributing to and through its inducement of
19 third parties, and offers its products or services, including those accused of
20 infringement here, to customers and potential customers located in this District.
21 Defendant markets, sells, and delivers accused products in this district, and has
22 committed acts of infringement in this judicial district.

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

26 **THE ACCUSED PRODUCTS**

27 12. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though
28 fully set forth in their entirety.

rhm
ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 13. Defendant uses, causes to be used, provides, supplies, or distributes one
2 or more computing devices such as its Cellular Gateways, Edge Management
3 Gateways, and Telematic Gateways, including, but not limited to, the G520 Series;
4 X300 Series; Lantronix EMG 7500W; and BOLERO40 Series, and any other
5 devices and hardware, software, and functionality that comprise substantially similar
6 functionality (collectively, the “Accused Products”).

7 14. On information and belief, the Accused Products perform wireless
8 communications and methods associated with performing and/or implementing
9 wireless communications including, but not limited to, wireless communications and
10 methods pursuant to various protocols and implementations, including, but not
11 limited to, Bluetooth, IEEE 802.11, and LTE protocols and various subsections
12 thereof, including, but not limited to, Bluetooth 5.0 and 5.1 and 5.4 and 802.11ac,
13 802.11b, and 802.11n.

14 15. On information and belief, the wireless communications perform and/or
15 implemented by the Accused Products, among other things, transmit data over
16 various media, compute time slot channels, generate packets for network
17 transmissions, perform or cause to be performed error estimation in orthogonal
18 frequency division multiplexed (“OFDM”) receivers, and various methods of
19 processing OFDM symbols.

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

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

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

25 18. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though
26 fully set forth in their entirety.

27 19. The USPTO duly issued U.S. Patent No. 6,549,583 (the “583 patent”) on
28 April 15, 2003, after full and fair examination of Application No. 09/790,429 which

rhm
ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 was filed February 21, 2001. The '583 patent is entitled "Optimum Phase Error
2 Metric for OFDM Pilot Tone Tracking in Wireless LAN."

3 20. FCS owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the '583 patent,
4 including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the '583
5 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

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

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

15 23. FCS or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations
16 required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for
17 infringement of the '583 patent.

18 24. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the '583 patent by
19 manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell
20 the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed, either literally
21 or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '583 patent. As just one
22 example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performs a
23 method of pilot phase error estimation in an orthogonal frequency division
24 multiplexed (OFDM) receiver. The method includes determining pilot reference
25 points corresponding to a plurality of pilots of an OFDM preamble waveform; and
26 estimating an aggregate phase error of a subsequent OFDM data symbol relative to
27 the pilot reference points using complex signal measurements corresponding to each
28 of the plurality of pilots of the subsequent OFDM data symbol and the pilot reference

1 points; wherein the estimating step comprises performing a maximum likelihood-
2 based estimation using the complex signal measurements corresponding to each of
3 the plurality of pilots of the subsequent OFDM data symbol and the pilot reference
4 points. *See* '583 Evidence of Use Charts, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

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

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

10 26. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in Paragraphs above as though
11 fully set forth in their entirety.

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

16 28. FCS owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the '616 patent,
17 including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the '616
18 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

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

23 30. The written description of the '616 patent describes in technical detail
24 each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of
25 the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim
26 limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been
27 considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.
28

1 31. FCS or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations
2 required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for
3 infringement of the '616 patent.

4 32. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the '616 patent by
5 manufacturing, providing, supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell
6 the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed, either literally
7 or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 12 of the '616 patent. As just one
8 example of infringement, Defendant, using the Accused Products, performs a
9 method of pilot phase error estimation in an orthogonal frequency division
10 multiplexed (OFDM) receiver. The method includes determining pilot reference
11 points corresponding to a plurality of pilots of an OFDM preamble waveform;
12 processing, in a parallel path to the determining step, the OFDM preamble waveform
13 with a fast Fourier transform; determining a phase error estimate of a subsequent
14 OFDM symbol relative to the pilot reference points; and processing, in the parallel
15 path to the determining step, the subsequent OFDM symbol with the fast Fourier
16 transform; wherein the determining the phase error estimate step is completed prior
17 to the completion of the processing of the subsequent OFDM symbol with the fast
18 Fourier transform in the parallel path. *See* '616 Evidence of Use Charts attached
19 hereto as **Exhibit B**.

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

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

25 34. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as
26 though fully set forth in their entirety. For purposes of this Count III, the term
27 "Accused Products" means Lantronix's Cellular Gateways and Edge Management
28 Gateways, including, but not limited to, the G520 Series; X300 Series; and Lantronix

1 EMG 7500W, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that
2 comprise substantially similar functionality.

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

7 36. FCS owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’040 patent,
8 including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’040
9 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

10 37. The claims of the ’040 patent are not directed to an abstract idea and are
11 not limited to well-understood, routine, or conventional activity. Rather, the claimed
12 inventions include inventive components that improve upon the function and
13 operation of preexisting data transmission methods.

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

19 39. FCS or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations
20 required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for
21 infringement of the ’040 patent.

22 40. Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe the
23 claims of the ’040 patent through the end of its term by manufacturing, providing,
24 supplying, using, distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For
25 instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe, either
26 literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the ’040 patent
27 through the end of its term. As just one example of infringement, Defendant, using
28 the Accused Products, performed a method for data transmission over first and

1 second media that overlap in frequency. The method included computing one or
2 more time division multiple access (TDMA) time-slot channels to be shared between
3 the first and second media for data transmission; allocating one or more time-slot
4 channels to the first medium for data transmission; allocating one or more of the
5 remaining time-slot channels to the second medium for data transmission; and
6 dynamically adjusting a number of timeslot channels assigned to one of the first and
7 second media during the data transmission to remain within limits of a desired level
8 of service. *See* '040 Evidence of Use Chart attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

9 41. Defendant has indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe the
10 '040 patent through the end of its term by inducing others to directly infringe the
11 '040 patent. Defendant has induced and continued to induce customers and end-
12 users, including, but not limited to, Defendant's customers, employees, partners, or
13 contractors, to directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents,
14 the '040 patent by providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant
15 has taken active steps, directly or through contractual relationships with others, with
16 the specific intent to cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that
17 infringes one or more claims of the '040 patent, including, for example, claim 1.
18 Such steps by Defendant has included, among other things, advising or directing
19 customers, personnel, contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an
20 infringing manner; advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an
21 infringing manner; or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused
22 Products in an infringing manner. Defendant had been performing these steps,
23 which constitute induced infringement with the knowledge of the '040 patent and
24 with the knowledge that the induced acts constitute infringement. Defendant has
25 been aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused Products by others
26 would infringe the '040 patent. Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

27 42. Defendant has indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly infringe by
28 contributing to the infringement of the '040 patent through the end of its term.

1 Defendant has contributed and continued to contribute to the direct infringement of
2 the '040 patent by its customers, personnel, and contractors. The Accused Products
3 have special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and
4 that have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the
5 '040 patent, including, for example, claim 1. The special features constitute a
6 material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '040 patent and are
7 not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing use.
8 Defendant's contributory infringement of the '040 patent was ongoing through the
9 end of its term.

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

12 44. Furthermore, on information and belief, Defendant has a policy or practice
13 of not reviewing the patents of others, including instructing its employees to not
14 review the patents of others, and thus have been willfully blind of FCS's patent
15 rights.

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

19 46. Defendant's infringement of the '040 patent is, has been, and continued
20 to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of FCS's rights under
21 the '040 patent through the end of its term.

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

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

27 48. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as
28 though fully set forth in their entirety.

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

6 50. FCS owns all substantial rights, interest, and title in and to the ’153 patent,
7 including the sole and exclusive right to prosecute this action and enforce the ’153
8 patent against infringers and to collect damages for all relevant times.

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

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

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

rhm.
ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 (“SVD”) of the channel matrix metric estimate to calculate estimated channel
2 singular values, and using the channel matrix metric and estimated channel singular
3 values to calculate a crosstalk measure for the sub-streams. *See* ’153 Evidence of
4 Use Charts attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

5 54. Defendant has also indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly
6 infringe the ’153 patent by inducing others to directly infringe the ’153 patent.
7 Defendant has induced distributors and end-users, including, but not limited to,
8 Defendant’s employees, partners, contractors, or customers, to directly infringe,
9 either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the ’153 patent by providing or
10 requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant took active steps, directly or
11 through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them
12 to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the
13 ’153 patent, including, for example, claim 1 of the ’153 patent. Such steps by
14 Defendant include, among other things, advising or directing personnel, contractors,
15 or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and
16 promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing
17 instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner.
18 Defendant is performing these steps, which constitute induced infringement with the
19 knowledge of the ’153 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts constitute
20 infringement. Defendant is aware that the normal and customary use of the Accused
21 Products by others would infringe the ’153 patent. Defendant’s inducement is
22 ongoing.

23 55. Defendant has also indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly
24 infringe by contributing to the infringement of the ’153 patent. Defendant has
25 contributed to the direct infringement of the ’153 patent by its personnel, contractors,
26 distributors, and customers. The Accused Products have special features that are
27 specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that have no substantial uses
28 other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the ’153 patent, including, for

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

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

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

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

13 59. Defendant's direct infringement of the '153 patent is, has been, and
14 continues to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of FCS's
15 rights under the patent.

16 60. FCS or its predecessors-in-interest have satisfied all statutory obligations
17 required to collect pre-filing damages for the full period allowed by law for
18 infringement of the '153 patent.

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

23 62. FCS has suffered irreparable harm, through its loss of market share and
24 goodwill, for which there is no adequate remedy at law. FCS has and will continue
25 to suffer this harm by virtue of Defendant's infringement of the '153 patent.
26 Defendant's actions have interfered with and will interfere with FCS's ability to
27 license technology. The balance of hardships favors FCS's ability to commercialize
28 its own ideas and technology. The public interest in allowing FCS to enforce its

1 right to exclude outweighs other public interests, which supports injunctive relief in
2 this case.

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

4 63. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as
5 though fully set forth in their entirety. For purposes of this Count V, the term
6 “Accused Products” means Lantronix’s Cellular Gateways and Edge Management
7 Gateways, including, but not limited to, the G520 Series; X300 Series; and Lantronix
8 EMG 7500W, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that
9 comprise substantially similar functionality.

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

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

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

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

27 68. Defendant has directly infringed and continued to directly infringe the
28 claims of the ’845 patent through the end of its term by importing, selling,

1 manufacturing, offering to sell, using, providing, supplying, or distributing the
2 Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed and continued to
3 directly infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1
4 of the '845 patent through the end of its term. As just one example of infringement,
5 the Accused Products used by Defendant provide a system comprising a processor,
6 a first transceiver configured to communicate *via* a first medium, a second
7 transceiver configured to communicate *via* a second medium, wherein at least one
8 of the first transceiver and the second transceiver is configured to retry transmission
9 of a packet at a lower rate if a prior transmission of the packet is not acknowledged,
10 an allocation unit configured to dynamically allocate data channels to one of the first
11 medium and the second medium based upon a desired level of service. *See* '845
12 Evidence of Use Chart attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

13 69. Defendant has also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly
14 infringe the '845 patent the end of its term by inducing others to directly infringe the
15 '845 patent. Defendant has induced distributors and end-users, including, but not
16 limited to, Defendant's employees, partners, contractors, or customers, to directly
17 infringe, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '845 patent by
18 providing or requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant took active steps,
19 directly or through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to
20 cause them to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more
21 claims of the '845 patent, including, for example, claim 1 of the '845 patent. Such
22 steps by Defendant include, among other things, advising or directing personnel,
23 contractors, or end-users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner;
24 advertising and promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner;
25 or distributing instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an
26 infringing manner. Defendant performed these steps, which constitute induced
27 infringement with the knowledge of the '845 patent and with the knowledge that the
28 induced acts constitute infringement. Defendant is aware that the normal and

rhm. ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 customary use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '845 patent.
2 Defendant's inducement is ongoing.

3 70. Defendant has also indirectly infringed and continued to indirectly
4 infringe by contributing to the infringement of the '845 patent through the end of its
5 term. Defendant has contributed to the direct infringement of the '845 patent by its
6 personnel, contractors, distributors, and customers. The Accused Products have
7 special features that are specially designed to be used in an infringing way and that
8 have no substantial uses other than ones that infringe one or more claims of the '845
9 patent, including, for example, claim 1 of the '845 patent. The special features
10 constitute a material part of the invention of one or more of the claims of the '845
11 patent and are not staple articles of commerce suitable for substantial non-infringing
12 use. Defendant's contributory infringement of the '845 patent was ongoing through
13 the end of its term.

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

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

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

22 74. Defendant's direct infringement of the '845 patent is, has been, and
23 continued to be willful, intentional, deliberate, or in conscious disregard of FCS's
24 rights under the patent '845 patent through the end of its term.

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

28 76. FCS has been damaged as a result of the infringing conduct by Defendant

1 alleged above. Thus, Defendant is liable to FCS in an amount that compensates it
2 for such infringements, which by law cannot be less than a reasonable royalty,
3 together with interest and costs as fixed by this Court under 35 U.S.C. § 284.

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

5 77. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as
6 though fully set forth in their entirety.

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

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

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

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

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

27 83. Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the
28 claims of the ’388 patent by manufacturing, providing, supplying, using,

rhm. ROZIER, HARDT
MCDONOUGH PLLC

1 distributing, selling, or offering to sell the Accused Products. For instance,
2 Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe, either literally or
3 under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '388 patent. As just one
4 example of infringement, Defendant performs a method including generating a
5 packet with a size corresponding to a protocol used for a network transmission,
6 wherein the packet comprises a preamble having a first training symbol and a second
7 training symbol. The method further includes increasing the size of the packet by
8 adding subcarriers to the second training symbol of the packet to produce an
9 extended packet, wherein a quantity of subcarriers of the second training symbol is
10 greater than a quantity of subcarriers of the first training symbol; and transmitting
11 the extended packet from an antenna. *See* '388 Evidence of Use Charts attached
12 hereto as **Exhibit F**.

13 84. Defendant has indirectly infringed and continues to indirectly infringe the
14 '388 patent by inducing others to directly infringe the '388 patent. Defendant has
15 induced and continue to induce customers and end-users, including, but not limited
16 to, Defendant's customers, employees, partners, or contractors, to directly infringe,
17 either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the '388 patent by providing or
18 requiring use of the Accused Products. Defendant has taken active steps, directly or
19 through contractual relationships with others, with the specific intent to cause them
20 to use the Accused Products in a manner that infringes one or more claims of the
21 '388 patent, including, for example, claim 1. Such steps by Defendant has included,
22 among other things, advising or directing customers, personnel, contractors, or end-
23 users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner; advertising and
24 promoting the use of the Accused Products in an infringing manner; or distributing
25 instructions that guide users to use the Accused Products in an infringing manner.
26 Defendant has been performing these steps, which constitute induced infringement
27 with the knowledge of the '388 patent and with the knowledge that the induced acts
28 constitute infringement. Defendant has been aware that the normal and customary

1 use of the Accused Products by others would infringe the '388 patent. Defendant's
2 inducement is ongoing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 92. FCS repeats and re-alleges the allegations in the Paragraphs above as
11 though fully set forth in their entirety. For purposes of this Count VII, the term
12 "Accused Products" means Lantronix's Cellular Gateways and Edge Management
13 Gateways, including, but not limited to, the G520 Series; X300 Series; and Lantronix
14 EMG 7500W, and any other devices and hardware, software, and functionality that
15 comprise substantially similar functionality.

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

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

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

27 96. The written description of the '053 patent describes in technical detail
28 each limitation of the claims, allowing a skilled artisan to understand the scope of

1 the claims and how the non-conventional and non-generic combination of claim
2 limitations is patently distinct from and improved upon what may have been
3 considered conventional or generic in the art at the time of the invention.

4 97. Defendant has directly infringed the claims of the '053 patent by
5 importing, selling, manufacturing, offering to sell, using, providing, supplying, or
6 distributing the Accused Products. For instance, Defendant has directly infringed,
7 either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, at least claim 1 of the '053 patent.
8 As just one example of infringement, Defendant performs a method comprising a
9 communication device storing data encoded for a plurality of different wireless
10 protocols, the communication device including a plurality of wireless transceivers,
11 each of which is configured to transmit data according to a corresponding one of the
12 plurality of different wireless protocols where the communication device selects one
13 of the plurality of different wireless protocols and encodes data of an unselected one
14 of the plurality of different wireless protocols into the selected wireless protocol, and
15 transmits the encoded data using the one of the plurality of wireless transceivers
16 corresponding to the selected wireless protocol. *See* '053 Evidence of Use Charts
17 attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

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

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

JURY DEMAND

25 100. FCS hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable by right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

26 101. FCS requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendant, and
27
28

1 that the Court grant FCS the following relief:

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

1 Dated: January 13, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Travis E. Lynch
3 Travis E. Lynch (SBN 335684)
4 **ROZIER HARDT McDONOUGH PLLC**
5 659 Auburn Ave NE, Suite 254,
6 Atlanta, Georgia 30312
7 Telephone: (404) 564-1866
8 Email: lynch@rhmttrial.com

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff FLEET CONNECT SOLUTIONS LLC*

10 **List of Exhibits**

- 11 A. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 6,549,583
- 12 B. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 6,633,616
- 13 C. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 7,058,040
- 14 D. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 7,260,153
- 15 E. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 7,656,845
- 16 F. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 7,742,388
- 17 G. Evidence of Use Chart – U.S. Patent 8,005,053