

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

SZ DJI TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 23-055 (CFC)
	)	
TEXTRON SPECIALIZED VEHICLES INC.,	)	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff SZ DJI Technology Co. Ltd. hereby alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff SZ DJI Technology Co. Ltd. (“DJI”) is a Chinese corporation with a place of business at Lobby of T2, DJI Sky City, No. 53 Xianyuan Road, Xili Community, Xili Street, Nanshan District, Shenzhen, China.

2. DJI is a worldwide leader in the innovations and development of unmanned air vehicles (UAVs) that has made DJI a commanding market leader of UAVs in the United States. Since its founding in 2006, DJI has filed over one thousand applications leading to hundreds of issued patents in the United States alone. These patents protect a wide range of technologies including movement control, motor control, and battery usage that are useful not only for air vehicles but for ground vehicles as well.

3. On information and belief, Defendant Textron Specialized Vehicles Inc. (“TSV” or “Defendant”) is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business 1451 Marvin Griffin Road, Augusta, GA 30906.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This action arises under the United States patent laws, 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, *et seq.* This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.

5. Upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant TSV because TSV has purposely availed itself of the privilege of conducting activities within this State and judicial District including by being organized under the laws of Delaware in this District.

6. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b).

THE ASSERTED PATENTS

7. DJI is now, and has been since its issuance, the assignee and sole owner of all right, title, and interest in United States Patent No. 11,462,116, titled “Polygon Shaped Vehicle Restriction Zones” (“the ’116 Patent”), which was duly and legally issued on October 4, 2022. A true and correct copy of the ’116 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

8. DJI is now, and has been since its issuance, the assignee and sole owner of all right, title, and interest in United States Patent No. 11,482,121, titled “Open Platform for Vehicle Restriction Region” (“the ’121 Patent”), which was duly and legally issued on October 25, 2022. A true and correct copy of the ’121 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

9. DJI is now, and has been since its issuance, the assignee and sole owner of all right, title, and interest in United States Patent No. 10,640,224, titled “Motor Control Method, Apparatus, and System” (“the ’224 Patent”), which was duly and legally issued on May 5, 2020. A true and correct copy of the ’224 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

10. As alleged below, Defendant’s vehicles infringe one or more claims of each of the ’116, ’121, and ’224 Patents (“the Asserted Patents”).

**THE ASSERTED PATENTS ARE DIRECTED
TO PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER**

11. The claims of the Asserted Patents each recite patent eligible subject matter in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

12. Section 101 precludes patent protection from claims that are directed to laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas. *Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank Int’l*, 573 U.S. 208, 216 (2014). The Supreme Court instructs courts to distinguish between claims that claim patent ineligible subject matter and those that “integrate the building blocks into something more.” *Id.* at 217. In the first step of a two-step analysis, it is determined whether the claims at issue are directed to a patent-ineligible concept such as laws of nature, natural phenomena, or abstract ideas *Id.*

13. If the claims are directed to a patent-ineligible concept, in the second step, the elements of each claim are considered both individually and as an ordered combination to determine whether the additional elements “‘transform the nature of the claim’ into a patent-eligible application.” *Id.* Step two determines whether the claims provide an “‘inventive concept’” that is “sufficient to ensure that the patent in practice amounts to significantly more than a patent upon the [ineligible concept] itself.” *Id.* at 217-18. When the claim limitations “involve more than performance of ‘well-understood, routine, [and] conventional activities previously known to the industry,’” the claim meets step two of the Alice two-step analysis, and the claim is patent eligible under Section 101. *Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*, 881 F.3d 1360, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2018) quoting *Content Extraction & Transmission LLC v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n*, 776 F.3d 1343, 1347-48 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *see also Aatrix Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc.*, 882 F.3d 1121, 1128 (Fed. Cir. 2018); *Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.*, 927 F.3d 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2019)(claims satisfy § 101 when the inventive concept reflects something more

than the application of an abstract idea using “well-understood, routine, and conventional activities.”). Whether a claim element or combination of elements is well-understood, routine, and conventional to a skilled artisan in the relevant field is a question of fact. *Berkheimer*, 881 F.3d at 1368; *Aatrix*, 882 F.3d at 1128.

U.S. PATENT NO. 11,462,116 – PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

14. The ’116 Patent discloses an innovative method and system for automatically changing the operation of vehicles, including ground vehicles, that approach or attempt to enter a custom-designed restriction region. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit A at Abstract, 2:44-51, 5:44 – 6:10, 7:29 – 8:11, 22:63 – 23:39, 47:7-27, Claim 1. This innovative method and system provides concrete technical improvements and solutions to conventional methods and systems for establishing and enforcing a restriction region through automatic control of vehicles approaching the restriction region and specific steps for delineating the restriction region. *See id.*

NOT ABSTRACT

15. Claim 1 of the ’116 Patent recites the automatic control of a physical object, the “ground vehicle,” according to the ground vehicle’s relationship to a restriction region. In other words, the ground vehicle itself is controlled to undertake automatically one or more response measures as opposed to a human operating the ground vehicle or protecting against encroachment of the restriction region. This automatic control of the ground vehicle provides a specific technical solution to problems arising from the advent of automated vehicles, computer control of them, and the need to establish restriction regions that cover restriction zones within which those vehicles cannot enter. *See id.* at 1:21-28, 47:8-22.

16. Instead of being limited to a particular geometric shape, the ’116 Patent establishes a specific method of forming and enforcing irregularly shaped restriction regions

using, for example, a combination of circles and lines tangential to the circles forming restriction strips that overcomes problems arising from regularly shaped restriction regions that can be over or under inclusive of the restriction zone. *See id.* at 4:60-64, 5:17-27, 21:7-11, 21:65 – 23:39, 24:2-5, Fig. 6. This specific method is reflected in Claim 1 of the '116 Patent which recites in pertinent part “generating ... one or more restriction strips along a boundary of the restriction region by connecting adjacent points of the two or more points ..., wherein at least one of the restriction strips is configured to have an area encompassed by a first circle, a second circle, and one or more lines running tangent to the first circle and the second circle.” Several dependent claims including, for example, Claims 3-11 further define the specific method for forming the restriction region.

17. The '116 Patent also establishes specific methods for automatically causing the vehicle itself to implement a response measure when approaching the restriction region. For example, when approaching a restriction region, the '116 Patent discloses affecting the operation of the vehicle by taking control of the vehicle away from an operator, adjusting the path or changing the direction of the vehicle, causing the vehicle to slow down or decelerate, or sending an alert to the vehicle. *See id.* at 7:29-42, 8:4-11, 19:33-61, 32:15-26. These types of response measures to automatically affect the operation of the vehicle are explicitly recited in the language of Claim 1 of the '116 Patent and its dependent claims including, for example, Claims 14-18, 20, and 21.

18. By providing a specific method for defining an irregularly shaped region and automatically affecting the operation of the vehicle, the claims of the '116 Patent neither provide for nor rely on a way of organizing human activity. This specific method does more than simply restrict ground vehicles from a certain region and consequently avoids preempting any abstract

ideas or common human activity. Rather, the claims provide a specific technical solution as defined by the claims (e.g., “generating ... one or more restriction strips along a boundary of the restriction region,” automatically causing a ground vehicle to undertake one or more response measures ... relative to the restriction region” in Claim 1) that affects the operation of the vehicle itself and thus obviates the need for organizing human activity. The ’116 Patent and its claims therefore disclose a specific technical solution of solving the problem of causing a vehicle – which may be under computer control and/or autonomous – to take measures itself to avoid entering a specifically designed restriction region.

NOT WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE, OR CONVENTIONAL

19. The ’116 Patent and its claims provide a technical improvement and solution to conventional, well-known systems for creating and enforcing restriction regions. Conventional systems limited or prevented access to a restriction region with fences or walls around the borders of the restriction region, signs or warnings about entering the restriction region, and/or guards or other personnel to restrict access to the restriction region. Whether using one or all of these conventional systems to restrict access to the restriction region, they each have significant limitations.

20. Among these limitations, the conventional systems offer limited or no flexibility to change the borders of the restricted region while also requiring significant expense and time to make the change. Changing the borders of the restriction region requires i) removal of existing fences or walls and building of new ones, ii) changing or moving signs, and iii) retraining guards to understand the new borders of the restriction region. The conventional systems also require the awareness and compliance of persons to avoid unauthorized access to the restriction region. Any person, whether in a vehicle or not, must be aware of how the walls, signs, and/or guards

delineate the borders of the restriction region, understand what limitations they impose on entering the restriction region, and willingly comply with those limitations. Conventional systems thus require human activity to arrange the walls, signs, and/or guards associated with the restriction region and human activity to have awareness and recognize the impact of the restriction region.

21. In contrast, the '116 Patent and its claims describe and recite a technical improvement to establishing the restriction region and a technical solution to preventing vehicles from breaching the restriction region. By automatically affecting the operation of a vehicle when approaching or attempting to enter the restriction region, the method of Claim 1 of the '116 Patent and the dependent claims obviates the need for an operator of the vehicle to (a) be aware of the borders of the restriction region; or (b) take action in response to approaching or entering the restriction region. Instead, the vehicle is controlled automatically without operator action. And by providing a technically implemented method for establishing the borders of the restriction region, the method of Claim 1 of the '116 Patent and the dependent claims obviate the need for any of the conventional methods of designating a restriction region and limiting access to it. Indeed, there is no need for the operator to even be aware of the existence of the restriction region.

22. The inventive system of the '116 Patent therefore overcomes the drawbacks of the conventional systems through implementation of multiple technical improvements. These technical improvements involve at least the flexibility of delineating the location and shape of a restriction region (*see id.* at 21:7-11, 21:65 – 23:39, Claim 1), using the information about the restriction regions to determine whether a vehicle is approaching or entering the restriction region (*see id.* at 7:29-42, 8:4-11, 19:33-61, 32:15-26, Claim 1), and automatically affecting the

operation of the vehicle to cause it to take certain response measures, such as decelerating or changing its direction, to ensure it does not enter the restricted region (*see id.* at 7:29-42, 8:4-11, 19:33-61, 32:15-26, Claims 1, 14, 18).

U.S. PATENT NO. 11,482,121 – PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

23. The ’121 Patent discloses another innovative method and system for automatically affecting the operation of vehicles, including ground vehicles, that approach or attempt to enter a user-defined restriction region. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit B at Abstract, 12:23-30, 13:35-57, 14:11 – 18:39, 22:29-58, 26:4-23, 27:28-58, 30:7-63, 31:33-43, 32:37-50, 34:44-57, 40:1-57, Claims 1, 18, and 28. This innovative method and system provides concrete technical improvements and solutions to conventional methods and systems for establishing and enforcing a restriction region through response measures that affect operation of vehicles approaching the restriction region established by user input of an authenticated user and stored in a changeable and updateable database. *See id.*

NOT ABSTRACT

24. Claim 1 of the ’121 Patent recites implementing one or more responses measures “to affect the operation of the ground vehicle” including forcing a change in direction or stopping the ground vehicle. It is therefore the ground vehicle itself in Claim 1 of the ’121 Patent that implements one or more response measures to affect its operation. Implementing response measures to affect the operation of the ground vehicle, like forcing a change in direction of the ground vehicle, provides a specific technical solution to problems arising from the advent of automated vehicles, computer control of them, and the need to establish restrictions regions that cover restriction zones within which those vehicles cannot enter. *See id.* at 13:22-67, 17:22 – 18:39, 22:29-58.

25. The '121 Patent not only establishes a specific system and method of forming and enforcing restriction regions according to user designations, but also ensures the user forming the restriction region that includes private property is authenticated and stores the information of the restriction region in a changeable database that can be updated in real-time. *See id.* at 13:52-67, 15:39-54, 23:14-41, 24:34 – 25:4; 30:7-63, 31:33-44, 34:44-57. This specific system and method is reflected in independent Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28 of the '121 Patent which recite “receiv[ing] one or more parameters of a designated restriction region for a ground vehicle ... [that] include at least a location associated with a private property,” “authenticat[ing] an identity of the user to determine whether the user is authorized to designate the restriction region,” and “stor[ing] the one or more parameters of the designated restriction region to a database.” Several dependent claims including, for example, Claims 4-13, 16-17, 23, and 27 further define the method for defining the restriction region, authenticating the user, and functioning of the database with more specific technical limitations.

26. The '121 Patent also establishes specific systems and methods for the vehicle itself to implement response measures that affect its operation when approaching the restriction region. For example, when approaching a restriction region, the '121 Patent discloses affecting the operation of the vehicle by forcing the vehicle to change course, preventing manual control of the vehicle, changing the speed of the vehicle, or sending an alert to the user. *See id.* at 17:22-18:39; 22:29-58. These types of response measures that are implemented to affect the operation of the vehicle are explicitly recited in the language of Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28 of the '121 Patent including, for example, forcing a change in its direction, moving it away from the restriction region, stopping it, and providing an alert.

27. By providing a specific method for designating the restriction region, authenticating users designating the restriction region, storing restriction region information in the database, and automatically affecting the operation of the vehicle within or near the restriction region, the claims of the '121 Patent neither provide for nor rely on a way of organizing human activity. This specific method does more than simply restrict ground vehicles from a certain region and consequently avoids preempting any abstract ideas or common human activity. Rather, the claims provide a specific technical solution as defined by the claims (e.g., “receiv[ing] one or more parameters of a designated restriction region for a ground vehicle,” “authenticat[ing] an identity of the user to determine whether the user is authorized to designate the restriction region,” “stor[ing] the one or more parameters of the designated restriction region to a database,” and “implement[ing] the one or more response measures to affect operation of the ground vehicle” in Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28) that affects the operation of the vehicle itself and thus obviates the need for organizing human activity. The '121 Patent and its claims therefore disclose a specific technical solution of solving the problem of causing a vehicle – which may be under computer control and/or autonomous – to take measures itself to avoid entering a specifically designed restriction region.

NOT WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE, OR CONVENTIONAL

28. The '121 Patent and its claims provide a technical improvement and solution to conventional, well-known systems for creating and enforcing restriction regions. Conventional systems limited or prevented access to a restriction region with fences or walls around the borders of the restriction region, signs or warnings about entering the restriction region, and/or guards or other personnel to restrict access to the restriction region. Whether using one or all of

these conventional systems to restrict access to the restriction region, they each have significant limitations.

29. Among these limitations, the conventional systems offer limited or no flexibility to change the borders of the restricted region while also requiring significant expense and time to make the change. Changing the borders of the restriction region requires i) removal of existing fences or walls and building of new ones, ii) changing or moving signs, and iii) retraining guards to understand the new borders of the restriction region. The conventional systems also require the awareness and compliance of persons to avoid unauthorized access to the restriction region. Any person, whether in a vehicle or not, must be aware of how the walls, signs, and/or guards delineate the borders of the restriction region, understand what limitations they impose on entering the restriction region, and willingly comply with those limitations. Conventional systems thus require human activity to arrange the walls, signs, and/or guards associated with the restriction region and human activity to have awareness and recognize the impact of the restriction region.

30. In contrast, the '121 Patent and its claims describe and recite a technical improvement to establishing the restriction region and storing restriction region information in a database and a technical solution to preventing vehicles from breaching the restriction region.

These technical improvements recited in the claims of the '121 Patent include:

- receiving one or more parameters of a designated restriction region for a ground vehicle input by a user via a user interface (Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28)
- authenticating user identify to confirm authority to designate the restriction region (Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28)

- storing the designated restriction region parameters in a database when the user is authorized (Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28)
- implementing response measures affecting operation of the ground vehicle when the ground vehicle is within or near the designated restriction region by forcing the ground vehicle to: change direction (Claims 1 and 18); move away from the designated restriction region (Claims 1 and 18); stop (Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28); or provide an alert. (Claims 1 and 18)

31. By implementing response measures affecting the operation of a vehicle when approaching or attempting to enter the restriction region, the systems of Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28 of the '121 Patent obviate the need for an operator of the vehicle to (a) be aware of the borders of the restriction region; or (b) be required to take action in response to approaching or entering the restriction region. Instead, the vehicle can be controlled without operator action. And by providing a technically implemented system for establishing the borders of the restriction region, authenticating users that can modify the restricted regions in real time, and storing restriction region information in a changeable and updateable database, the systems of Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28 of the '121 Patent and the dependent claims obviate the need for any of the conventional methods of designating a restriction region and limiting access to it. Indeed, there is no need for the operator to even be aware of the existence of the restriction region.

32. The inventive system of the '121 Patent overcomes the drawbacks of the conventional systems through implementation of multiple technical improvements. These technical improvements involve at least the flexibility of delineating the location and shape of a restricted region (*see id.* at 13:52-67, 15:39-54, 23:14-41, 24:34 – 25:4; 30:7-63, 31:33 – 32:65, 34:44-57, Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28), authenticating users that can modify the restricted regions in

real time (*see id.* at 6:63-67, 30:7-63, 31:33-44, 34:44-57, Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28) storing information about the restricted region in a database (*see id.* at 13:52-67, 15:39-54, 23:14-41, 24:34 – 25:4; 30:7-63, 31:33-44, 34:44-57, Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28), using the information in the database about the restriction regions to determine whether a vehicle is approaching or entering the restriction region (*see id.* at 17:22-18:39; 22:29-58, 24:34 – 25:4, Claims 1, 18, 24, and 28), and automatically affecting the operation of the vehicle to ensure it does not enter the restricted region (*see id.* at 17:22-18:39; 22:29-58, Claims 1, 18, and 28).

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,640,224 – PATENT ELIGIBLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

33. The '224 patent discloses an inventive method and apparatus for motor control that accounts for fluctuations in a battery electrical parameter, such as its charge, by compensating motor control according to the change. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit C at Abstract; 1:28-33, 3:28-38, 3:58 – 4:33, 5:17-35, 6:27-42, 8:19-61, Claims 1 and 12. The innovative method and apparatus provide concrete technical improvements and solutions to conventional methods and systems by calculating a compensation amount for a motor control signal based on a battery parameter such as charge quantity or voltage and modifying the motor control signal according to the compensation amount. *See id.*

NOT ABSTRACT

34. A conventional motor control system provides battery power to an electronic speed controller (ESC), which outputs a voltage to a motor to cause the motor to rotate. *See id.* at 3:6-27, Figs. 1-2. A vehicle controller sends a control signal, such as a throttle signal, to the ESC to modify the voltage output to the motor. *See id.* But battery fluctuations, such as battery discharge, cause the voltage output from the ESC to the motor to change its rotational speed (e.g., decrease its rotational speed during battery discharge). *See id.* at 1:28-33. The motor's

rotation speed reduction can correspondingly cause a vehicle, such as an unmanned air vehicle (UAV), to have a slower response and reduced power at times when the vehicle needs to perform actions requiring high mobility. *See id.* at 1:33-36, 3:28-33.

35. The '224 Patent describes an apparatus and method for implementing a technical solution to this problem in the conventional motor control system. In particular, the '224 Patent describes calculating a compensation amount for the motor control signal according to the present electrical parameter of the battery and modifying the motor control signal according to the compensation amount. *See id.* at 3:58 – 4:26. As a result, the motor rotation speed is prevented from fluctuating despite the change of the battery charge, which suppresses any slow response or decreased power of the motor during vehicle operation. *See id.* at 4:26-33.

36. The '224 Patent also describes anticipating and preventing fluctuations by determining a compensation amount for a future drop in battery voltage based on a current battery voltage and a voltage prediction model (“preset model”). *See id.* at 4:58-5:13, 5:37-6:42. Additionally, the '224 Patent describes a real-time feedback method to compensate for battery voltage decrease including a specific example of maintaining a motor control signal of 2V when the battery voltage drops from a full voltage of 5V to 3V. *See id.* at 6:43-7:18. The '224 Patent thus provides specific ways and a concrete example of modifying or compensating a motor control signal by a compensation amount calculated according to a present battery parameter.

37. The specific technical solutions provided in the '224 Patent as recited in independent Claims 1, 9, and 12 regarding calculation of the compensation amount based on the present battery electrical parameter and corresponding modification of the motor control signal are not functions that can be performed mentally or on paper with a pencil but rather require a technical and physical implementation. To prevent the motor's speed from fluctuating, the

method and apparatus of Claims 1, 9, and 12 can be performed rapidly, in real time (e.g., using the preset voltage model), thereby avoiding slow response or decreased power of the motor during vehicle operation. *See id.* at 5:32-36, 5:66 – 6:9, 8:19-32; *see also* Claims 4-8, 11, and 15-17 (reciting calculating in “real time” and use of “preset voltage model” to determine “compensation amount”). Avoiding fluctuations in the battery charge that affect motor rotation cannot be substituted by a mental process because the human mind can neither implement those effects on a motor nor calculate the compensation amount based on an obtained battery electrical parameter and modify the motor control signal according to the compensation amount quickly enough to avoid the slow response or decreased motor power that Claims 1, 9 and 12 and the dependent claims avoid. The ’224 Patent specifically indicates that such proactive compensation of the motor control signal improves the “timeliness of modifying the control signal of the motor,” which underscores the need for sufficiently quick calculation of the compensation amount and modification of the motor control signal to avoid untoward effects that cannot be achieved through a mental process. *Id.* at 5:30-36.

NOT WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE, OR CONVENTIONAL

38. The technical improvement and solution provided by the ’224 Patent and its claims are further illustrated by the contrast to conventional, well-known systems described in the ’224 Patent for generating motor control signals. In the conventional, well-known systems, a battery supplies power to an electronic speed controller (ESC), and the ESC outputs a voltage to a motor to control motor speed. *See id.* at 1:20-23. The ESC receives a throttle signal sent from a controller to indicate whether to increase or decrease the rotation speed of the motor. *See id.* at 1:23-27.

39. But since battery voltage continuously decreases during use, the voltage outputted from the ESC to the motor also decreases as the battery voltage decreases, even as the throttle signal remains unchanged in the conventional, well-known systems. *See id.* at 1:28-32 The decreased voltage correspondingly causes a decrease in motor rotation speed, which can negatively affect vehicles needing high mobility by slowing the response and decreasing the motor output power. *See id.* at 1:23-27.

40. In contrast, the '224 Patent and its claims describe and recite a technical improvement and solution to the problems caused by the conventional, well-known systems for controlling motor rotation in a vehicle. By calculating a compensation amount for a motor control signal according to the battery's present electrical parameter and modifying the motor control signal according to the compensation amount, the method and apparatus of Claims 1, 9, and 12 of the '224 Patent prevent a drop in motor rotation speed. *See id.* at 4:17-33, 5:20-35, 8:19-33. Dependent claims including, for example, Claims 4-8, 11, and 15-17 of the '224 Patent recite even more specific solutions for determining the compensation amount such as calculating the compensation amount in real time and using a preset voltage model to calculate the compensation amount, both of which further improve motor control over conventional, well-known systems. By preventing drops in motor rotation speed due to battery discharge while maintaining the same throttle signal, including anticipatory adjustments in real-time using preset voltage models, vehicles that need high mobility can suppress a slower response and decreased power output from the motor. *See id.* at 8:19-33, 8:49-61.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,462,116

41. The facts and allegations of Paragraphs 1-40 are incorporated by reference for this First Cause of Action as though fully set forth herein.

42. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the '116 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing the EZGO RXV and Freedom RXV golf carts with the Shield Plus, Shield, 7, 7EX, or 10EX having the Geofencing feature in the United States, without the authority of DJI.

43. The EZGO RXV and Freedom RXV golf carts with the Shield Plus, Shield, 7, 7EX, or 10EX having the Geofencing feature infringe at least claim 1 of the '116 Patent, as set forth in the accompanying claim chart attached as Exhibit D.

44. Accordingly, Defendant directly infringes at least claim 1 of the '116 Patent. DJI expressly reserves the right to assert additional claims in this litigation against the same or additional products of Defendant, in accordance with the rules of this Court.

45. DJI has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is therefore liable to DJI for damages in an amount that adequately compensates for Defendant's 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.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,482,121

46. The facts and allegations of Paragraphs 1-45 are incorporated by reference for this Second Cause of Action as though fully set forth herein.

47. In violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the '121 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing the EZGO RXV and Freedom RXV golf carts with the Shield Plus, Shield, 7, 7EX, or 10EX having the Geofencing feature in the United States, without the authority of DJI.

48. The EZGO RXV and Freedom RXV golf carts with the Shield Plus, Shield, 7, 7EX, or 10EX having the Geofencing feature infringe at least claim 1 of the '121 Patent, as set forth in the accompanying claim chart attached as Exhibit E.

49. Accordingly, Defendant directly infringes at least claim 1 of the '121 Patent. DJI expressly reserves the right to assert additional claims in this litigation against the same or additional products of Defendant, in accordance with the rules of this Court.

50. DJI has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is therefore liable to DJI for damages in an amount that adequately compensates for Defendant's 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.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 10,640,224

51. The facts and allegations of Paragraphs 1-50 are incorporated by reference for this Third Cause of Action as though fully set forth herein.

52. On information and belief, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, Defendant has directly infringed and continues to directly infringe the '224 Patent by making, using, offering for sale, selling, and/or importing the EZGO RXV, EZGO Freedom RXV, EZGO Liberty, EZGO Express, Hauler (800, 800x, PRO, PRO-X), Refresher Oasis, and Shuttle (2, 2+2, 4, 6, 8) carts with the ELiTE Lithium powertrain in the United States, without the authority of DJI.

53. On information and belief, the EZGO RXV, EZGO Freedom RXV, EZGO Liberty, EZGO Express, Hauler (800, 800x, PRO, PRO-X), Refresher Oasis, and Shuttle (2, 2+2, 4, 6, 8) carts with the ELiTE Lithium powertrain infringe at least claim 12 of the '224 Patent, as set forth in the accompanying claim chart attached as Exhibit F.

54. Accordingly, on information and belief, Defendant directly infringes at least claim 12 of the '224 Patent. DJI expressly reserves the right to assert additional claims in this litigation against the same or additional products of Defendant, in accordance with the rules of this Court.

55. DJI has been damaged as a result of Defendant's infringing conduct. Defendant is therefore liable to DJI for damages in an amount that adequately compensates for Defendant's 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.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff DJI requests trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff DJI requests the following relief:

- (a) judgment that the Defendant infringes the '116 Patent;
- (b) judgment that the Defendant infringes the '121 Patent;
- (c) judgment that the Defendant infringes the '224 Patent;
- (d) award Plaintiff DJI damages in an amount sufficient to compensate it for Defendant's infringement of one or more claims of the '116, '121, and/or '224 Patents, together with pre-judgment and post-judgment interest and costs, and all other damages permitted under 35 U.S.C. § 284;
- (e) an accounting for infringing sales not presented at trial and an award by the Court of additional damages for any such infringing sales;
- (f) declare this case to be exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and award Plaintiff DJI its attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred in this action; and
- (g) such other and further relief as the Court finds just and proper.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

/s/ Michael J. Flynn

OF COUNSEL:

Kenneth R. Adamo
Marc Weinstein
Scott Daniels
Mao Wang
XSENSUS, LLP
100 Daingerfield Road, Suite 402
Alexandria VA 22314
(571) 376-6333

Thomas E. Bejin
BEJIN BIENEMAN PLC
2000 Town Center, Suite 800
Southfield, Michigan 48075
(313) 528-4882

Jack B. Blumenfeld (#1014)
Michael J. Flynn (#5333)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899-1347
(302) 658-9200
jblumenfeld@morrisnichols.com
mflynn@morrisnichols.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

May 17, 2023