

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

INTERVAL LICENSING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AOL, INC.; APPLE, INC.; eBAY, INC.;  
FACEBOOK, INC.; GOOGLE INC.;  
NETFLIX, INC.; OFFICE DEPOT, INC.;  
OFFICEMAX INC.; STAPLES, INC.;  
YAHOO! INC.; AND YOUTUBE, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT  
INFRINGEMENT**

**JURY DEMAND**

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC, files this complaint for patent infringement against Defendants AOL, Inc., Apple, Inc., eBay, Inc., Facebook, Inc., Google Inc., Netflix, Inc., Office Depot, Inc., OfficeMax Inc., Staples, Inc., Yahoo! Inc., and YouTube, LLC. Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC alleges:

**THE PARTIES**

1  
2 1. Interval Licensing LLC (“Interval”) is a limited liability company duly  
3 organized under the laws of the state of Washington, with its principal place of business at  
4 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 900, Seattle, WA 98104.

5  
6 2. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
7 AOL, Inc. (“AOL”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the state  
8 of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 770 Broadway, New York, NY 10003.

9  
10 3. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
11 Apple, Inc. (“Apple”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the  
12 state of California, with its principal place of business at 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, CA  
13 95014.

14  
15 4. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
16 eBay, Inc. (“eBay”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the state  
17 of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 2145 Hamilton Avenue, San Jose, CA  
18 95125.

19  
20 5. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
21 Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of  
22 the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1601 S. California Avenue, Palo  
23 Alto, CA 94304.

24  
25 6. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
26 Google Inc. (“Google”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the  
27 state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway,  
28 Mountain View, CA 94043.

1 7. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
2 Netflix, Inc. (“Netflix”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the  
3 state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 100 Winchester Circle, Los Gatos,  
4 CA 95032.

5 8. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
6 Office Depot, Inc. (“Office Depot”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the  
7 laws of the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 6600 North Military  
8 Trail, Boca Raton, FL 33496.

9 9. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
10 OfficeMax Inc. (“OfficeMax”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws  
11 of the state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 263 Shuman Boulevard,  
12 Naperville, IL 60563.

13 10. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
14 Staples, Inc. (“Staples”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the  
15 state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 500 Staples Drive, Framingham,  
16 MA 01702.

17 11. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
18 Yahoo! Inc. (“Yahoo”) is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the  
19 state of Delaware, with its principal place of business at 701 First Avenue, Sunnyvale, CA  
20 94089.

21 12. Interval is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendant  
22 YouTube, LLC (“YouTube”) is a limited liability company duly organized and existing  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 under the laws of the state of California, with its principal place of business at 901 Cherry  
2 Avenue, San Bruno, CA 94066.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 13. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338(a)  
5 because this action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1 *et seq.*  
6 Venue is proper in this Federal Circuit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)-(c) and 1400(b) in  
7 that a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this district and the  
8 defendants have a regular and established practice of business in this district and have  
9 committed acts of infringement in this district.  
10

11 **INTERVAL RESEARCH CORPORATION WAS A PIONEER IN THE**  
12 **TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY**

13 14. Interval Research Corporation (“Interval Research”) was founded in 1992 by  
14 Paul Allen and David Liddle to perform advanced research and development in the areas of  
15 information systems, communications, and computer science. Mr. Allen, who served as  
16 Interval Research’s chairman, was one of the earliest pioneers of personal computer  
17 software. He co-founded Microsoft with Bill Gates in 1975 and later founded Vulcan  
18 Ventures in 1986. Mr. Liddle served as Interval Research’s president and chief executive  
19 officer. He was instrumental in developing fundamental technologies starting in the early  
20 1970s when he worked at Xerox at the Palo Alto Research Center.  
21

22 15. Starting with Mr. Allen, Mr. Liddle, and a handful of scientists and inventors,  
23 Interval Research evolved into one of the preeminent technology firms. It employed over  
24 110 of the world’s leading scientists, physicists, and engineers, and was at the forefront in  
25 designing next-generation science and technology.  
26  
27  
28

1 16. In addition to the research that Interval Research conducted, it also provided  
2 funding and assistance for other projects. For example, Interval Research served as an  
3 outside collaborator to and provided research funding for Sergey Brin and Lawrence Page's  
4 research that resulted in Google. Indeed, a Google screenshot dated September 27, 1998  
5 entitled "About Google!" identifies Interval Research in the "Credits" section as one of two  
6 "Outside Collaborators" and one of four sources of "Research Funding" for Google. See  
7 Sept. 27, 1998 Website "About Google!" attached as Exhibit 1.

9 17. Mr. Brin and Mr. Page also recognized Interval Research's funding in the  
10 "Acknowledgements" section of their 1998 research article entitled "Anatomy of a Large-  
11 Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine" in which they "present Google."

13 18. As a testament to Interval Research's innovation, it was issued approximately  
14 300 patents in less than a decade. Four of those patents are the patents-in-suit.

15 19. Interval Licensing LLC owns the patents-in-suit. The company is owned and  
16 controlled by Mr. Allen.

18 **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,263,507**

19 20. On July 17, 2001, United States Patent No. 6,263,507 ("the '507 patent") was  
20 duly and legally issued for an invention entitled "Browser for Use in Navigating a Body of  
21 Information, With Particular Application to Browsing Information Represented By  
22 Audiovisual Data." Interval was assigned the '507 patent and continues to hold all rights  
23 and interest in the '507 patent. A true and correct copy of the '507 patent is attached hereto  
24 as Exhibit 2.

26 21. Defendant AOL has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
27 of the '507 patent. AOL is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
28

1 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
2 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.

3 22. Defendant Apple has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
4 of the '507 patent. Apple is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
5 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
6 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.  
7

8 23. Defendant eBay has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
9 of the '507 patent. eBay is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
10 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
11 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.  
12

13 24. Defendant Google has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
14 of the '507 patent. Google is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
15 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
16 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.  
17

18 25. Defendant Netflix has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
19 of the '507 patent. Netflix is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
20 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
21 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.  
22

23 26. Defendant Office Depot has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
24 claims of the '507 patent. Office Depot is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35  
25 U.S.C. § 271 by making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare,  
26 and display segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.  
27  
28

1 27. Defendant OfficeMax has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
2 claims of the '507 patent. OfficeMax is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C.  
3 § 271 by making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and  
4 display segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.

5 28. Defendant Staples has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
6 of the '507 patent. Staples is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
7 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
8 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.

9 29. Defendant Yahoo has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
10 of the '507 patent. Yahoo is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
11 making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and display  
12 segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.

13 30. Defendant YouTube has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
14 claims of the '507 patent. YouTube is liable for infringing the '507 patent under 35 U.S.C.  
15 § 271 by making and using websites, hardware, and software to categorize, compare, and  
16 display segments of a body of information as claimed in the patent.

17 31. Defendants AOL, Apple, eBay, Google, Netflix, Office Depot, OfficeMax,  
18 Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube's acts of infringement have caused damage to Interval, and  
19 Interval is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages sustained by Interval as a result  
20 of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial. Defendants'  
21 infringement of Interval's exclusive rights under the '507 patent will continue to damage  
22 Interval, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless  
23 enjoined by this Court. Interval reserves the right to allege, after discovery, that Defendants'  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 infringement is willful and deliberate, entitling Interval to increased damages under 35  
2 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35  
3 U.S.C. § 285.

4 **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,034,652**

5 32. On March 7, 2000, United States Patent No. 6,034,652 ("the '652 patent")  
6 was duly and legally issued for an invention entitled "Attention Manager for Occupying the  
7 Peripheral Attention of a Person in the Vicinity of a Display Device." Interval was assigned  
8 the '652 patent and continues to hold all rights and interest in the '652 patent. A true and  
9 correct copy of the '652 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.  
10

11 33. Defendant AOL has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
12 of the '652 patent. AOL is liable for infringing the '652 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
13 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
14 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
15 patent.  
16

17 34. Defendant Apple has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
18 of the '652 patent. Apple is liable for infringing the '652 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
19 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
20 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
21 patents.  
22

23 35. Defendant Google has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
24 of the '652 patent. Google is liable for infringing the '652 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
25 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
26  
27  
28



1 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
2 patent.

3 36. Defendant Yahoo has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
4 of the '652 patent. Yahoo is liable for infringing the '652 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
5 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
6 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
7 patent.  
8

9 37. Defendants AOL, Apple, Google, and Yahoo's acts of infringement have  
10 caused damage to Interval, and Interval is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages  
11 sustained by Interval as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof  
12 at trial. Defendants' infringement of Interval's exclusive rights under the '652 patent will  
13 continue to damage Interval, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate  
14 remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court. Interval reserves the right to allege, after  
15 discovery, that Defendants' infringement is willful and deliberate, entitling Interval to  
16 increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorney's fees and costs incurred in  
17 prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.  
18  
19

20 **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,788,314**

21 38. On September 7, 2004, United States Patent No. 6,788,314 ("the '314  
22 patent") was duly and legally issued for an invention entitled "Attention Manager for  
23 Occupying the Peripheral Attention of a Person in the Vicinity of a Display Device."  
24 Interval was assigned the '314 patent and continues to hold all rights and interest in the '314  
25 patent. A true and correct copy of the '314 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 4.  
26  
27  
28

1 39. Defendant AOL has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
2 of the '314 patent. AOL is liable for infringing the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
3 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
4 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
5 patent.

6  
7 40. Defendant Apple has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
8 of the '314 patent. Apple is liable for infringing the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
9 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
10 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
11 patent.

12  
13 41. Defendant Google has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
14 of the '314 patent. Google is liable for infringing the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
15 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
16 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
17 patent.

18  
19 42. Defendant Yahoo has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
20 of the '314 patent. Yahoo is liable for infringing the '314 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
21 making, using, offering, providing, and encouraging customers to use products that display  
22 information in a way that occupies the peripheral attention of the user as claimed in the  
23 patent.

24  
25 43. Defendants AOL, Apple, Google, and Yahoo's acts of infringement have  
26 caused damage to Interval, and Interval is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages  
27 sustained by Interval as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof  
28

1 at trial. Defendants' infringement of Interval's exclusive rights under the '314 patent will  
2 continue to damage Interval, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate  
3 remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court. Interval reserves the right to allege, after  
4 discovery, that Defendants' infringement is willful and deliberate, entitling Interval to  
5 increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorney's fees and costs incurred in  
6 prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.  
7

8 **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,757,682**

9 44. On June 29, 2004, United States Patent No. 6,757,682 ("the '682 patent")  
10 was duly and legally issued for an invention entitled "Alerting Users to Items of Current  
11 Interest." Interval was assigned the '682 patent and continues to hold all rights and interest  
12 in the '682 patent. A true and correct copy of the '682 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 5.  
13

14 45. Defendant AOL has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
15 of the '682 patent. AOL is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
16 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
17 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.  
18

19 46. Defendant Apple has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
20 of the '682 patent. Apple is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
21 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
22 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.  
23

24 47. Defendant eBay has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
25 of the '682 patent. eBay is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
26 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
27 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.  
28

1 48. Defendant Facebook has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
2 claims of the '682 patent. Facebook is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C.  
3 § 271 by making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts  
4 that information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

5 49. Defendant Google has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
6 of the '682 patent. Google is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
7 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
8 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

9 50. Defendant Netflix has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
10 of the '682 patent. Netflix is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
11 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
12 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

13 51. Defendant Office Depot has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
14 claims of the '682 patent. Office Depot is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35  
15 U.S.C. § 271 by making and using websites and associated hardware and software to  
16 provide alerts that information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

17 52. Defendant OfficeMax has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
18 claims of the '682 patent. OfficeMax is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C.  
19 § 271 by making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts  
20 that information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

21 53. Defendant Staples has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
22 of the '682 patent. Staples is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
2 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.

3 54. Defendant Yahoo has infringed and continues to infringe one or more claims  
4 of the '682 patent. Yahoo is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271 by  
5 making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts that  
6 information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.  
7

8 55. Defendant YouTube has infringed and continues to infringe one or more  
9 claims of the '682 patent. YouTube is liable for infringing the '682 patent under 35 U.S.C.  
10 § 271 by making and using websites and associated hardware and software to provide alerts  
11 that information is of current interest to a user as claimed in the patent.  
12

13 56. Defendants AOL, Apple, eBay, Facebook, Google, Netflix, Office Depot,  
14 OfficeMax, Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube's acts of infringement have caused damage to  
15 Interval, and Interval is entitled to recover from Defendants the damages sustained by  
16 Interval as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial.  
17 Defendants' infringement of Interval's exclusive rights under the '682 patent will continue  
18 to damage Interval, causing irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law,  
19 unless enjoined by this Court. Interval reserves the right to allege, after discovery, that  
20 Defendants' infringement is willful and deliberate, entitling Interval to increased damages  
21 under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorney's fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action  
22 under 35 U.S.C. § 285.  
23  
24

25 **JURY DEMAND**

26 57. Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Interval  
27 respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues properly triable by jury.  
28

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

1  
2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Interval Licensing LLC requests entry of judgment in its  
3 favor and against Defendants as follows:

4 a) Declaration that (1) Defendants AOL, Apple, eBay, Google, Netflix, Office  
5 Depot, OfficeMax, Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube have infringed U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507;  
6 (2) Defendants AOL, Apple, eBay, Facebook, Google, Netflix, Office Depot, OfficeMax,  
7 Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube have infringed U.S. Patent No. 6,757,682; and (3) Defendants  
8 AOL, Apple, Google, and Yahoo have infringed U.S. Patent Nos. 6,034,652 and 6,788,314.  
9

10 b) Awarding the damages arising out of (1) Defendants' AOL, Apple, eBay,  
11 Google, Netflix, Office Depot, OfficeMax, Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube's infringement of  
12 U.S. Patent No. 6,263,507; (2) Defendants' AOL, Apple, eBay, Facebook, Google, Netflix,  
13 Office Depot, OfficeMax, Staples, Yahoo, and YouTube's infringement of U.S. Patent No.  
14 6,757,682; and (3) Defendants' AOL, Apple, Google, and Yahoo's infringement of U.S.  
15 Patent Nos. 6,034,652 and 6,788,314, to Interval, together with prejudgment and post-  
16 judgment interest, in an amount according to proof;  
17

18 c) Permanently enjoining Defendants and their respective officers, agents,  
19 employees, and those acting in privity with them, from further infringement, including  
20 contributory infringement and/or inducing infringement, of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,263,507,  
21 6,034,652, 6,788,314, and 6,757,682, or in the alternative, awarding a royalty for post-  
22 judgment infringement;  
23

24 d) Awarding attorney's fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or as otherwise  
25 permitted by law; and  
26  
27  
28

1 e) Awarding such other costs and further relief as the Court may deem just and  
2 proper.

3  
4 Dated: August 27, 2010

/s/ Justin A. Nelson

5 Justin A. Nelson  
6 WA Bar No. 31864  
7 E-Mail: jnelson@susmangodfrey.com  
8 Matthew R. Berry  
9 WA Bar No. 37364  
10 E-Mail: mberry@susmangodfrey.com  
11 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
12 1201 Third Ave, Suite 3800  
13 Seattle, WA 98101  
14 Telephone: (206) 516-3880  
15 Facsimile: (206) 516-3883

16 Max L. Tribble, Jr.  
17 E-Mail: mtribble@susmangodfrey.com  
18 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
19 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
20 Houston, Texas 77002  
21 Telephone: (713) 651-9366  
22 Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

23 Michael F. Heim  
24 E-mail: mheim@hpcllp.com  
25 Eric J. Enger  
26 E-mail: eenger@hpcllp.com  
27 Nathan J. Davis  
28 E-mail: ndavis@hpcllp.com  
HEIM, PAYNE & CHORUSH, L.L.P.  
600 Travis, Suite 6710  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Telephone: (713) 221-2000  
Facsimile: (713) 221-2021

Attorneys for INTERVAL LICENSING LLC