| 1 2 3 | Victor M. Felix (Bar No. 179622) Brian J. Kennedy (Bar No. 280921) PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVE & SAVITCH LLP 525 B Street, Suite 2200 | S | |
|--|---|---|--|
| 4 | San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 238-1900 | | |
| 5 | Email: victor.felix@procopio.com Email: brian.kennedy@procopio.com | <u>n</u> | |
| 6 | Jonathan T. Suder (<i>Pro Hac Vice To</i> Brett M. Pinkus (<i>Pro Hac Vice To Be</i> | | |
| 7 | Glenn S. Orman (<i>Pro Hac Vice To Be</i> FRIEDMAN, SUDER & COOKE | | |
| 8 | Tindall Square Warehouse No. 1 604 East 4 th Street, Suite 200 | | |
| 9 | Fort Worth, Texas 76102 Telephone: (817) 334-0400 | | |
| 10 | Email: jts@fsclaw.com | | |
| 11 | Email: pinkus@fsclaw.com Email: orman@fsclaw.com | | |
| 12 13 | Attorneys for Plaintiff SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. | | |
| 14 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 15 | CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| | SOUTHERN DIVISION | | |
| 16 | SOUTH | ERN DIVISION | |
| 17 | SOUTH SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. | CASE NO. | |
| | SURGICAL IRRIGATION | | |
| 17 18 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. STRYKER CORPORATION, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. STRYKER CORPORATION, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. STRYKER CORPORATION, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. STRYKER CORPORATION, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. Plaintiff, vs. STRYKER CORPORATION, | CASE NO. COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT | |

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. files its Complaint against Defendant STRYKER CORPORATION, alleging as follows:

--

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff SURGICAL IRRIGATION TECHNOLOGIES INC. ("Plaintiff") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located in Costa Mesa, CA.
- 2. Upon information and belief, STRYKER CORPORATION ("Defendant") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Michigan, with its principal place of business in Kalamazoo, MI. Defendant sells certain arthroscopic products, including but not limited to the FloControl Arthroscopy Pump, through its Stryker Endoscopy division, with its principal place of business in San Jose, California. Defendant may be served with process through its registered agent CT Corporation System located at 818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 United States Code. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction of such action under 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a).
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction by this Court. Defendant has committed such purposeful acts and/or transactions in the State of California that it reasonably knew and/or expected that it could be hailed into a California court as a future consequence of such activity. Defendant makes, uses, and/or sells infringing products within the Central District of California and has a continuing presence and the requisite minimum contacts with the Central District of California such that this venue is a fair and reasonable one. Upon information and belief, Defendant has transacted and, at the time of the filing of this Complaint, is continuing to transact business within the Central

District of California. For all of these reasons, personal jurisdiction exists and venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b), 1391(c), and 1400(b).

THE '194 PATENT

- 5. On December 19, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,162,194 ("the '194 Patent") was duly and legally issued for "Surgical Irrigation Apparatus and Method for Use." A true and correct copy of the '194 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.
- 6. By way of assignment, Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title, and interest in and to the '194 Patent, including all rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and collect damages for all relevant times.
- 7. As it pertains to this lawsuit, the '194 Patent, very generally speaking, relates to a surgical irrigation apparatus used for delivering irrigation fluid to a surgical site.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Patent Infringement)

- 8. Plaintiff repeats and realleges every allegation set forth above.
- 9. Upon information and belief, and without authority, consent, right, or license, and in direct infringement of the '194 Patent, Defendant manufactures, makes, has made, uses, practices, imports, provides, supplies, distributes, sells, and/or offers for sale products or systems that infringe one or more claims in the '194 Patent. Such conduct constitutes, at a minimum, patent infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).
- 10. More specifically, Defendants, at a minimum, have directly infringed and continue to directly infringe at least Claim 18 of the '194 Patent because it manufactures, makes, has made, uses, practices, imports, provides, supplies, distributes, sells, and/or offers for sale surgical irrigation system, including at least the FloControl Arthroscopy Pump, inflow and outflow tubing sets, and hand piece.

- 11. Defendant has had actual notice of the '194 Patent at least as early as the receipt of service of this Complaint.
- 12. Plaintiff has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is, thus, liable to Plaintiff in an amount that adequately compensates Plaintiff for their infringement, 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.
- 13. Upon information and belief, Defendant will continue its infringement of the '194 Patent unless enjoined by the Court. Defendant's infringing conduct has caused Plaintiff irreparable harm and will continue to cause such harm without the issuance of an injunction.
- 14. Plaintiff reserves the right to assert additional claims of the '194 Patent.

JURY DEMAND

15. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff requests that the Court find in its favor and against Defendant, and that the Court grant Plaintiff the following relief:

- a. Judgment that one or more claims of the '194 Patent have been infringed, either literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, by Defendant;
- b. Judgment that Defendant account for and pay to Plaintiff all damages to and costs incurred by Plaintiff because of its infringing activities and other conduct complained of herein;
- c. That Defendant, its officers, agents, servants and employees, and those persons in active concert and participation with any of them, be permanently enjoined from infringement of the '194 Patent. In the

| 1 | | alternative, if the Court finds that | at an injunction is not warranted, | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | | Plaintiff requests an award of post j | udgment royalty to compensate for | |
| 3 | | future infringement; | | |
| 4 | d. | d. That Defendant's infringement be found to be willful from the time | | |
| 5 | Defendants became aware of the infringing nature of its services, | | afringing nature of its services, and | |
| 6 | | that the Court award treble damage | ges for the period of such willful | |
| 7 | infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284. | | § 284. | |
| 8 | e. | That Plaintiff be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on | | |
| 9 | the damages caused to it by reason of Defendant's infringing activity | | of Defendant's infringing activities | |
| 10 | | and other conduct complained of he | erein; | |
| 11 | f. That this Court declare this an exceptional case and award Plaintiff i | | | |
| 12 | | reasonable attorney's fees and cos | sts in accordance with 35 U.S.C. | |
| 13 | | § 285; and | | |
| 14 | g. | That Plaintiff be granted such other and further relief as the Court may | | |
| 15 | | deem just and proper under the circu | umstances. | |
| 16 | DATED: October 8, 2015. | | Victor M. Felix tor M. Felix | |
| 17 | | PRO | OCOPIO, CORY, RGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP | |
| 18 | | 525 San | 5 B Street, Suite 2200 n Diego, CA 92101 ephone: (619) 238-1900 | |
| 19 | | Tele Em | ephone: (619) 238-1900 ail: victor.felix@procopio.com | |
| 20 | | | athan T. Suder | |
| 21 | | Bre | ett M. Pinkus enn S. Orman | |
| 22 | | FRI | IEDMAN, SUDER & COOKE | |
| 23 | | 604 For | dall Square Warehouse No. 1 East 4 th Street, Suite 200 | |
| 24 | | Tele Fac | et Worth, Texas 76102 ephone: (817) 334-0400 esimile: (817) 334-0401 | |
| 25 | | Em | ail: jts@fsclaw.com ail: pinkus@fsclaw.com | |
| 26 | | Em | ail: orman@fsclaw.com | |
| 2728 | | Atto SUI TEO | orneys for Plaintiff RGICAL IRRIGATION CHNOLOGIES, INC. | |
| | 1 | | | |