

Of Counsel
Theodore F. Shiells
Texas State Bar No. 00796087
Shiells Law Firm P.C.
Dallas, Texas 75202
Tel: (214) 979-7312
Fax: (214) 979-7301
tfshiells@shiellslaw.com

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Simon Nicholas Richmond (“Richmond” or “Plaintiff”), for his claims against Defendants Chien Luen Industries Co., Ltd., Inc. (Chien Luen Florida), Chien Luen Industries Co., Ltd., Inc. (Chien Luen China), King of Fans, Inc., Lowes Home Centers, Inc. and Lowe's Companies, Inc., (collectively, “Defendants”) makes and files this Complaint and alleges as follows:

1. THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Richmond.

1. Plaintiff Richmond is an individual and resident of New Jersey.

B. Defendants.

2. Chien Luen Industries Co., Ltd., Inc. (Chien Luen Florida) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida, having a principal place of business at 1967 NW 22 Street, Oakland Park, Florida 33311. Chien Luen may be served through its agent for service of process, Hsiuying Huang, 1967 NW 22 Street, Oakland Park, Florida 33311.

3. Chien Luen Industries Co., Ltd., Inc. (Chien Luen China) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of China, having a principal place of business at No. 69, Sec. 1, Sung Chu Road, Peitun Dist., Taichung, China. Chien Luen China may be served pursuant to the Hague Convention.

4. King of Fans, Inc. (King of Fans) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida, having a principal place of business at 1951 NW 22nd Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33311. King of Fans may be served through its agent for service of process, Hsiuying Huang, 1951 NW 22nd Street, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33311.

5. Upon information and belief, Chien Luen Florida, Chien Luen China, and King of Fans are alter egos of each other and/or are so closely related to one another that they are jointly and severally liable and may be considered the same company for purposes of this Complaint.

6. For purposes of this Complaint, Chien Luen Florida, Chien Luen China, and King of Fans shall be collectively referred to as “Chien Luen/King of Fans.”

7. Lowe's Companies, Inc. (Lowe's Companies) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of North Carolina, having a principal place of business at 1000 Lowe's Boulevard, Mooresville, North Carolina 28117. Lowe's may be served through its agent for service of process, Corporation Service Company, 327 Hillsborough Street, Raleigh, NC 27603.

8. Lowes Home Centers, Inc. (Lowes Home Centers) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of North Carolina, having a principal place of business at 1605 Curtis Bridge Rd., Wilkesboro NC 28697. Lowes Home Centers may be served through its agent for service of process, Corporation

Service Company, 327 Hillsborough Street, Raleigh, NC 27603.

9. Upon information and belief, Lowe's Companies and Lowes Home Centers are alter egos of each other and/or are so closely related to one another that they are jointly and severally liable and may be considered the same company for purposes of this Complaint.

10. For purposes of this Complaint, Lowe's Companies and Lowes Home Centers shall be collectively referred to as "Lowe's."

2. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

11. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, including 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281-285. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

3. PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE

A. General.

12. Personal jurisdiction over each of the Defendants is proper pursuant to New Jersey Long-Arm Statute, J.J. CT. R. 4:4-4 and principles of due process.

13. The United States Defendants all have sufficient minimum contacts with New Jersey and this district and the maintenance of this suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

14. The foreign Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts with the United States and the maintenance of this suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

B. Specific Jurisdiction.

1. United States Defendants.

15. Personal jurisdiction over all United States Defendants is proper under principles of specific jurisdiction. Upon information and belief, all United States Defendants have transacted and solicited business in New Jersey and in this district related to the subject matter of the claims alleged herein and, upon information and belief, have committed infringement in this state and district by importing, offering to sell and/or selling goods infringing one or more of the Patents-in-Suit, to one or more customers in this state and district, and/or by exposing for sale, offering for sale and/or selling such infringing goods to New Jersey residents, including by means of a commercially interactive website targeting New Jersey. Further, each Defendant's infringement that is the subject of the claims alleged has caused Plaintiff to suffer damages and other losses in New Jersey and this district, a result that was reasonably foreseeable to each United States Defendant at the time each committed its misconduct.

2. Foreign Defendants.

16. Personal jurisdiction over all foreign Defendants is proper under principles of specific jurisdiction. Upon information and belief, each foreign Defendant has transacted and solicited business in the United States related to the subject matter of the claims alleged herein and, upon information and belief, has committed acts of direct infringement in the United States and/or has knowingly induced others to do so. Upon information and belief, all foreign Defendants have knowingly induced infringement in the United States by offering to sell and/or selling goods infringing one or more of the patents in suit to its or his customers, with knowledge of one or more of Plaintiff's patents and that the foreign Defendant's goods infringe one or more of Plaintiff's patents, and with knowledge and/or willful blindness to the fact that its products will be imported into and offered for sale, sold and/or used in the United States by others. Further, each foreign Defendant's infringement that is the subject of the claims alleged has caused Plaintiff to suffer damages and other losses in the United States, a result that was reasonably foreseeable to each foreign Defendant at the time each committed its misconduct.

C. General Jurisdiction.

17. Personal jurisdiction over the United States is proper under principles of general jurisdiction in that these Defendants either reside in this state and district and/or have regularly and purposefully conducted business in New Jersey and this district.

18. Personal jurisdiction over the foreign Defendants is also proper under principles of general jurisdiction in that, upon information and belief, the foreign Defendants have regularly and purposefully conducted business in the United States.

19. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (c) (3), an alien may be sued in any judicial district and the joinder of such a Defendant shall be disregarded in determining whether the action may be brought with respect to the other Defendants.

D. Venue.

20. Venue also properly lies in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because each Defendant either resides in this district and/or has committed acts of infringement in this district.

21. Venue also properly lies in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) (2) and/or (3) because either a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims recited below, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is in this district, or there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1391, and this court has personal jurisdiction over at least one Defendant.

22. Venue is proper in this district over the foreign corporations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (c) (3) in that an alien may be sued in any judicial district and the joinder of such a Defendant shall be disregarded in determining whether the action

may be brought with respect to the other Defendants.

4. JOINDER PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 299

23. Joinder is proper under 35 U.S.C. § 299.

24. Joinder is proper and in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 299(a) because (1) Plaintiff is asserting his right to relief from the Defendants' unlawful patent infringement against the Defendants jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same series of transactions or occurrences relating to the using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling the same solar-powered garden light that infringes one or more of the patents in suit and (2) questions of fact related to Defendants' unlawful patent infringement and common to all Defendants will arise in this action.

25. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned solar-powered garden light is the same between and among the Defendants because, regardless of brand name or model numbers, the solar-powered garden lights of each Defendant is being repeatedly produced by a common Chinese-located manufacturer.

26. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned same solar-powered garden lights are also the same between and among the Defendants because, regardless of brand name or model numbers, the solar-powered garden lights of each Defendants are the same in all respects pertinent to at least the '477, 827 and '700 Patents and the facts underlying the claim of infringement asserted against each

Defendant share an aggregate of operative facts that give rise to each cause of action, such that the same proof of infringement as to any one Defendant's solar-powered garden light will also prove infringement of the other Defendants' solar-powered garden lights. In particular, upon information and belief, the acts of infringement occurred during the same time period, the Defendants are related as at least supplier-customer, the Defendants use identically sourced components, there is an overlap of the products' development and manufacture in that the Defendants copied one another's products, and that this case involves a claim for lost profits.

27. As to the foreign Defendants, joinder is also proper in that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (c) (3), an alien may be sued in any judicial district and the joinder of such a Defendant shall be disregarded in determining where the action may be brought with respect to the other Defendants.

5. FACTUAL BACKGROUND – PATENTS IN SUIT

28. For many years, Richmond has engaged in the development, manufacture, and sale of solar-powered garden lighting. Richmond has taken steps to protect his innovative inventions and designs. In particular, Richmond owns United States utility and design patents relating to his solar garden lights.

29. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 7,196,477 A1, entitled "Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors," ("the '477 Color-Changing Patent"), which duly

and legally issued to Richmond on March 27, 2007.

30. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 7,429,827 A1, entitled “Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors,” (“the ’827 Color-Changing Patent”), which duly and legally issued to Richmond on September 30, 2008.

31. Richmond is the inventor and owner of all right, title, and interest to the United States patent number 8,362,700 A1, entitled “Solar Powered Light Assembly to Produce Light of Varying Colors,” (“the ’700 Color-Changing Patent”), which duly and legally issued to Richmond on January 29, 2013.

32. At all times relevant to this action, Richmond has complied with any notice provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 287 as they may relate to the Patents in Suit.

6. COUNT NO. 1 – INFRINGEMENT OF PLAINTIFF’S PATENTS

A. Same Accused Product Infringement by All Defendants.

33. Upon information and belief, each Defendant infringes and/or has infringed one or more claims of Plaintiff’s ‘477, ‘827 and ‘700 Color-Changing Patents by making, using, selling, offering to sell, and/or importing, the same solar-powered garden light generally described as a Color-Changing Ball Solar Stake Path Light and/or by knowingly inducing others to do so.

34. Upon information and belief, Lowe’s sells and/or has sold the Color-Changing Ball Solar Stake Path Light under one or more designations, which infringes

one or more claims of Plaintiff's '477, '827 and '700 Color-Changing Patents, including but not limited to its Portfolio 2-Pack Stainless Steel Solar-Powered LED Path Lights Item # 317218 – Model # 00286.

35. Upon information and belief, Chien Luen/King of Fans sells and/or has sold the Color-Changing Ball Solar Stake Path Light under one or more designations, which infringes one or more claims of Plaintiff's '477, '827 and '700 Color-Changing Patents, including but not limited to the Portfolio 2-Pack Stainless Steel Solar-Powered LED Path Lights Item # 317218–Model # 00286, sold to Lowe's.

B. Additional Infringements by Defendants.

36. Upon information and belief, Lowe's also sells and/or has sold one or more other models of solar-powered garden lights which infringe one or more claims of Plaintiff's '477, '827 and '700 Color-Changing Patents, including but not limited to its Portfolio Stainless Steel Solar-Powered LED Path Lights Item # 329346 – Model # 00942.

37. Upon information and belief, Chien Luen/King of Fans also imports, offers for sale, sells and/or has imported, offered for sale, and sold one or more other models of solar-powered garden lights which infringe one or more claims of Plaintiff's '477, '827 and '700 Color-Changing Patents, including but not limited to the Portfolio Stainless Steel Solar-Powered LED Path Lights Item # 329346 – Model # 00942, sold to Lowe's.

38. Plaintiff has been damaged as a result of Defendants' infringing activities and will continue to be damaged unless such activities are enjoined by this Court. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, Plaintiff is entitled to damages adequate to compensate for the infringement of Plaintiff's Patents, including, inter alia, lost profits and/or a reasonable royalty.

39. Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed if Defendants' patent infringement continues. Plaintiff relies upon his for protection of his business' intellectual property and the rampant infringement of his patents by Defendants robs Plaintiff's business of its intellectual assets and denies Plaintiff the exclusivity in the marketplace for offering and selling his products to which he is entitled under the Patent Laws. This seriously damages Plaintiff in a manner that cannot be adequately compensated by money alone. Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction prohibiting Defendants, their directors, officers, employees, agents, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, and anyone else in active concert or participation with them, from taking any other actions that would infringe Plaintiff's Patents.

7. WILLFULNESS OF THE INFRINGEMENT

40. As a result of Richmond's activities, Defendants Chien Luen/King of Fans are believed to have knowledge of at least Plaintiff's '477 and '827 Color Changing Patents and that one or more of their products infringe one or more claims of those patents. As such, their infringement of Plaintiff's '477 and '827 Color

Changing Patents is deliberate and willful. The allegations and factual contentions set forth in this paragraph are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3).

8. JURY DEMAND

41. Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 38(b), for all issues so triable.

9. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the court enter judgment granting Plaintiffs the following relief:

a. For the utility Patents-in-Suit, awarding Plaintiff his damages adequate to compensate for Defendants' infringement of Plaintiff's Patents, including, inter alia, lost profits and/or a reasonable royalty;

b. Awarding treble of the damages and/or reasonable royalty, and that those damages be trebled on account of the willful nature of the infringement, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, for those Defendants against whom willfulness is alleged;

c. Declaring this case to be exceptional under 35 U.S.C. §285 and awarding Plaintiff his attorneys' fees, costs and expenses related to bringing this action;

- d. Enjoining Defendants from infringing Plaintiff's Patents; and
- e. Awarding Plaintiff such further and other relief as the Court

deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lawrence C. Hersh
Lawrence C. Hersh
Attorney at Law
17 Sylvan Street
Suite 102B
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070
Tel: (201) 507-6300
Fax: (201) 507-6311
lh@hershlegal.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Simon Nicholas Richmond

Of Counsel

Theodore F. Shiells
Texas State Bar No. 00796087
Shiells Law Firm P.C.
Dallas, Texas 75202
Tel: (214) 979-7312
Fax: (214) 979-7301
tfshiells@shiellslaw.com