IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

SECURE COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, Plaintiff, **v.** **GOOGLE LLC,** Defendant.	Case No. 1:25-cv-1207-DAE Jury Trial Demanded

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1)(B), Plaintiff Secure Communication Technologies, LLC ("SCT") files this First Amended Complaint for patent infringement against Defendant Google LLC ("Google") alleging as follows:

BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF THE SUIT

1. This is a claim for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code. This case asserts infringement of United States Patent Nos. 8,116,749 (the "'749 Patent"), 11,334,918 (the "'918 Patent"), 11,443,344 (the "'344 Patent"), 11,687,971 (the "'971 Patent"), and 11,995,685 (the "'685 Patent") (collectively, "the Patents-in-Suit").

2. The Patents-in-Suit are owned by SCT.

3. The inventions described and claimed in the Patents-in-Suit were invented and developed by Mr. James Proctor Jr. (a pioneering researcher, inventor, entrepreneur and well-recognized technical expert in the field of wireless communications) and his father, James A. Proctor III.

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

THE PARTIES

4. SCT is a Texas limited liability company with its principal place of business at 204 North Fredonia Street, Longview, Texas 75601.

5. Defendant is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of Delaware. Google may be served with process through its registered agent, the Corporation Service Company d/b/a/ CSC-Lawyers Inc., at 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, Texas 78701.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101, et seq. This Court's jurisdiction over this action is proper under the above statutes, including 35 U.S.C. § 271, et seq., 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and § 1338 (jurisdiction over patent actions).

7. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant consistent with the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and the Texas Long Arm Statute.

8. Defendant has regularly and systematically transacted business in Texas, directly or through subsidiaries or intermediaries, and/or committed acts of patent infringement in Texas as alleged more particularly below.

9. Defendant has placed infringing products into the stream of commerce by shipping those products into Texas or knowing that the products would be shipped into Texas.

10. In addition, on information and belief, Google conducts business at its Texas facilities related to its mobile devices, including the devices accused of infringement in this case.

11. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b).

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

12. Venue is proper at to Defendant in this district under 28 U.S.C. §1400(b) because Defendant has a regular and established place of business in this district and has committed acts of infringement in this district.

13. On information and belief, Defendant has a regular and established place of business in Austin, Texas, and is responsible for importing and selling smartphones, tablets, laptops, and other mobile devices and equipment in the United States.

14. Defendant makes, uses, sells, offers for sale, and/or imports Google-branded smartphones, tablets, laptops, and other electronics in this District, including the products accused of infringement herein.

15. On information and belief, Defendant has operated, and on information and belief continues to operate, permanent offices located at 500 West Second Street, Austin, Texas, 78701; 601 West Second Street, Austin, Texas 78701; 901 East 5th Street, Austin, Texas 78701; 500 Chichon Street B, Austin, Texas 78702; 3601 South Congress Avenue, J-100, Austin, Texas 78704; 304 East 24th Street, Austin, Texas 78705; 845 Interchange Boulevard, Austin, Texas 78721; 6013 Technical Center Drive, Austin, Texas 78721; 4100 Smith School Road, Austin, Texas 78744; 807 Ruby Drive, Austin, Texas 78753; 10200 McKalla Place, Austin, Texas 78758; 2350 South Midkiff Road, Midland, Texas 79701; and 1100 West County Road, Midland, Texas.

16. Defendant also employs full-time personnel, such as engineers and managers in this district, including in Travis County.

17. Defendant has also committed acts of infringement in this district by commercializing, marketing, selling, distributing, and servicing certain Google-branded devices, including but not limited to phones, tablets, and laptops, which are devices Plaintiff accuses of infringement in this case.

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

18. Defendant has also committed acts of infringement in this district by developing, commercializing, marketing, selling, and distributing its Android operating system for use in third party phones and tablets, which are devices Plaintiff accuses of infringement in this case.

THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT

The '749 Patent

19. The '749 Patent, entitled "Protocol for anonymous wireless communication," duly and legally issued on February 14, 2012, from U.S. Patent Application No. 12/364,938, filed on February 3, 2009, naming James A. Proctor, Jr. and James A. Proctor III as the inventors. A true and correct copy of the '749 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and is incorporated by reference.

20. The '749 Patent claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Nos. 61/095,359 (filed on September 9, 2008) and 61/095,001 (filed on September 8, 2008).

21. SCT is the owner and assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and under the '749 Patent.

22. SCT has standing to sue for infringement of the '749 Patent.

The '918 Patent

23. The '918 Patent, entitled "Exchanging identifiers between wireless communication to determine further information to be exchanged or further services to be provided," duly and legally issued on May 17, 2022, from U.S. Patent Application No. 15/271,410, filed on September 21, 2016, naming James A. Proctor, Jr. and James A. Proctor III as the inventors. A true and correct copy of the '918 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and is incorporated by reference.

24. The '918 Patent claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 14/861,563, which was filed on September 22, 2015. The '918 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 14/472,477 (filed on August 29, 2014 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,161,164),

13/775,435 (filed on February 25, 2013 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,849,698), 13/212,723 (filed on August 18, 2011 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,385,896), and 12/364,828 (filed on February 3, 2009 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,090,359). The '918 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Nos. 61/095,359 (filed on September 9, 2008) and 61/095,001 (filed on September 8, 2008).

25. SCT is the owner and assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and under the '918 Patent.

26. SCT has standing to sue for infringement of the '918 Patent.

The '344 Patent

27. The '344 Patent, entitled "Efficient and secure communication using wireless service identifiers," duly and legally issued on September 13, 2022, from U.S. Patent Application No. 17/366,826, filed on July 2, 2021, naming James A. Proctor, Jr. and James A. Proctor III as the inventors. A true and correct copy of the '344 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 3 and is incorporated by reference.

28. The '344 Patent claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 16/817,896, which was filed on March 13, 2020 and issued as U.S. Patent No. 11,074,615. The '344 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 15/271,410 (filed on September 21, 2016), 14/861,563 (filed on September 22, 2015), 14/472,477 (filed on August 29, 2014 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,161,164), 13/775,435 (filed on February 25, 2013 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,849,698), 13/212,723 (filed on August 18, 2011 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,385,896), and 12/364,828 (filed on February 3, 2009 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,090,359). The '344 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Nos. 61/095,359 (filed on September 9, 2008) and 61/095,001 (filed on September 8, 2008).

29. SCT is the owner and assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and under the ’344 Patent.

30. SCT has standing to sue for infringement of the ’344 Patent.

The ’971 Patent

31. The ’971 Patent, entitled “Efficient and secure communication using wireless service identifiers,” duly and legally issued on June 27, 2023, from U.S. Patent Application No. 17/942,197, filed on September 12, 2022, naming James A. Proctor, Jr. and James A. Proctor III as the inventors. A true and correct copy of the ’971 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 4 and is incorporated by reference.

32. The ’971 Patent claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 17/366,826 (filed on June 2, 2021 and which issued as the ’344 Patent), 16/817,896 (filed on March 13, 2020 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 11,074,615), 15/271,410 (filed on September 21, 2016), 14/861,563 (filed on September 22, 2015), 14/472,477 (filed on August 29, 2014 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,161,164), 13/775,435 (filed on February 25, 2013 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,849,698), 13/212,723 (filed on August 18, 2011 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,385,896), and 12/364,828 (filed on February 3, 2009 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,090,359). The ’344 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Nos. 61/095,359 (filed on September 9, 2008) and 61/095,001 (filed on September 8, 2008).

33. SCT is the owner and assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and under the ’971 Patent.

34. SCT has standing to sue for infringement of the ’971 Patent.

The ’685 Patent

35. The ’685 Patent, entitled “Efficient and secure communication using wireless service identifiers,” duly and legally issued on May 28, 2024, from U.S. Patent Application No.

18/204,528, filed on June 1, 2023, naming James A. Proctor, Jr. and James A. Proctor III as the inventors. A true and correct copy of the '685 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 5 and is incorporated by reference.

36. The '685 Patent claims priority to U.S. Patent Application Nos. 17/942, 197 (filed on September 12, 2022 and which issued as the '971 Patent), 17/366,826 (filed on June 2, 2021 and which issued as the '344 Patent), 16/817,896 (filed on March 13, 2020 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 11,074,615), 15/271,410 (filed on September 21, 2016), 14/861,563 (filed on September 22, 2015), 14/472,477 (filed on August 29, 2014 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,161,164), 13/775,435 (filed on February 25, 2013 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,849,698), 13/212,723 (filed on August 18, 2011 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,385,896), and 12/364,828 (filed on February 3, 2009 and which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,090,359). The '344 Patent also claims priority to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Nos. 61/095,359 (filed on September 9, 2008) and 61/095,001 (filed on September 8, 2008).

37. SCT is the owner and assignee of all rights, title, and interest in and under the '685 Patent.

38. SCT has standing to sue for infringement of the '685 Patent.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

39. As detailed below, Defendant has infringed (and continues to infringe) one or more claims of each Patent-in-Suit by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States, and/or practicing the claimed method via its use of, certain Google-branded phones and tablets, including but not limited to the Pixel 10, Pixel 10 Pro Fold, Pixel 10 Pro, Pixel 10 Pro XL, Pixel 9a, Pixel 9 Pro, Pixel 9 Pro XL, Pixel 9 Pro Fold, Pixel 9, Pixel 8 Pro, Pixel 8, Pixel 8a, and Pixel Tablet.

40. Also, as detailed below, Defendant has infringed (and continues to infringe) one or more claims of each Patent-in-Suit through the making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States, and/or practicing the claimed method via its use of, certain Chromebook laptops, including those branded, marketed, and sold by Acer, ASUS, HP, and Lenovo.

41. Also, as detailed below, Defendant has infringed (and continues to infringe) one or more claims of each Patent-in-Suit through the making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States, and/or practicing the claimed method via its use of, certain Android smartphones, including those branded, marketed, and sold by Asus, Motorola Mobility and OnePlus.

42. The products described and identified in preceding paragraphs numbered 39 through 41 are referred to herein as the "Accused Products."

43. The Accused Products infringe one or more claims of each Patent-in-Suit via several features and associated functionalities including, but not limited to, Google's Nearby Share/Quick Share, Fast Pair, and Find Hub (previously known as Find My) features.

44. On information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit and of its infringement of the Patents-in-Suit at least through receipt or knowledge of SCT's Original Complaint in *Secure Communication Technologies, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.*, No. 2:24-cv-00484-JRG in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas (the "Samsung Case") and/or through receipt or knowledge of SCT's Infringement Contentions in the Samsung Case, in which SCT identified how the Accused Products in that case (including products that utilize Google's Android operating system) infringe claims of the Patents-in-Suit. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the Patents-in-Suit, and its infringement of the Patents-in-Suit,

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

at least since sometime before July 2, 2025, when Defendant filed IPR Nos. 2025-01181, -1182, and -1183, challenging the validity of certain of the Patents-in-Suit and referencing the Samsung Case.

45. Defendant was aware of Mr. James Proctor Jr., the co-inventor of the Patents-in-Suit, prior to the filing of this lawsuit via Mr. Proctor's expert work and his prior dealings with Defendant.

46. In addition, Defendant was aware of the '749 Patent at least as of February 9, 2012, when Mr. Proctor informed Defendant of the existence of the '749 Patent, other patents related to the '749 Patent, and their relevance to Defendant and Defendant's products. *See* Exhibit 6.

47. In addition, Defendant was aware of U.S. Patent No. 8,090,359 ("the '359 Patent") at least as of February 9, 2012, when Mr. Proctor informed Defendant of the existence of the '359 Patent, other patents related to the '359 Patent, and their relevance to Defendant and Defendant's products. *See Id.* The '918, '344, '971, and '685 Patents-in-Suit all claim priority, as continuation applications, to the '359 Patent. In other words, Defendant has had knowledge of the disclosures of the '918, '344, '971, and '685 Patents-in-Suit since at least February 9, 2012, when Defendant learned of the '359 Patent.

48. In addition, Defendant has had knowledge of the '749 Patent and other patents related to the Patents-in-Suit via their disclosure during Defendant's patent prosecution activities. For example, Defendant disclosed the '749 Patent during the prosecution of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/716,675 (which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,185,148) via a December 17, 2012 Information Disclosure Statement submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"). Defendant also cited U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2010/0061294 (an application which issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,936,736) during the prosecution of U.S. Patent

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

Application No. 12/969,291 (which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,364,172) via a May 3, 2012 Information Disclosure Statement. Defendant also cited U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2010/0061294 during the prosecution of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/738,384 (which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,923,831) via a May 7, 2014 Information Disclosure Statement. Defendant also cited U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2011/0300802 (an application which issued as U.S. Patent No. 8,369,842) during the prosecution of U.S. Patent Application No. 17/305,266 (which issued as U.S. Patent No. 11,395,356) via a July 2, 2021 Information Disclosure Statement.

49. On information and belief, Defendant employs a global team of individuals responsible for Defendant's patent matters, including portfolio development and counseling, patent review and analysis, patent monitoring and tracking, and patent licensing and acquisitions.

50. On information and belief, Defendant's internal legal team consists of over 900 lawyers, a substantial portion of which are tasked with, and focus on, patent matters, including patent review and analysis, patent monitoring and tracking, and patent licensing and acquisitions. This is in addition to Defendant's substantial external legal team that also supports and counsels Defendant on patent related matters.

51. Further discovery may reveal earlier knowledge of one or more of the Patents-in-Suit, which would provide additional evidence of Defendant's willful infringement of the Patents-in-Suit.

52. All of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit claim patent-eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

53. Each Patent-in-Suit claims priority to one or more provisional applications filed as early as September 8, 2008.

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

54. Each Patent-in-Suit claims priority to one or more non-provisional applications filed as early as February 3, 2009.

55. The inventions claimed in each asserted claim in each Patent-in-Suit are entitled to an invention date at least as early as September 8, 2008.

56. In the alternative, the inventions claimed in each asserted claim in each Patent-in-Suit are entitled to an invention date at least as early as February 3, 2009.

57. None of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit claims are directed to an abstract idea, and each such claim is thus patent-eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

58. While devices such as smartphones, tablets, and other wireless devices are ubiquitous in today's world, the state of such technologies was much different in the September 2008 to February 2009 time period. The iPhone was released in 2007, and the iPad was released in 2010. Google did not release its first smartphone (the Nexus One) until January 2010.

59. The inventions in the Patents-in-Suit were years ahead of the release of the accused products and functionalities. For example, on information and belief, Google's Nearby Share feature was not released until 2020, Google's Fast Pair feature was not released until 2017, and Google's Find Hub feature was not released until 2013.

60. In addition, the inventions of the Patents-in-Suit were appreciably before the release of version 4.0 of the Bluetooth specification (the first version to include Bluetooth Low Energy), which was released in 2010.

61. Each of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit is directed to addressing specific technological problems in wireless devices and recite specific technological improvements to such wireless devices.

62. Each of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit contain inventive concepts such that they are patent-eligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

63. None of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit recite subject matter that, taken as a whole, was well-understood, routine, or conventional in the September 2008 to February 2009 time period.

64. Google's own patent filings show that none of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit were well-understood, routine, or conventional in the September 2008 to February 2009 time period. For example, Google filed the application leading to U.S. Patent No. 9,961,494 in August 2012 and European Patent Application EP2885571A1 in July 2013, both entitled "Sharing content with nearby devices."

65. Defendant's acts of infringement have caused damage to SCT. SCT is entitled to recover from Defendant the damages sustained by SCT as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial.

66. For each count of infringement listed below, SCT incorporates and re-states the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs above, including these General Allegations, as if fully set forth in each count of infringement.

COUNT I – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '749 PATENT

67. SCT incorporates herein the allegations made in paragraphs 1 through 66.

68. Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the '749 Patent, including, for example, claim 1, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States infringing products including, but not limited to, the Accused Products.

69. An exemplary claim chart demonstrating Defendant's infringement of the '749 Patent is attached as Exhibit 7 and incorporated herein by reference.

70. Additionally, Defendant has indirectly infringed the ’749 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least by inducing customers to purchase the Accused Products and/or by instructing customers how to use the Accused Products in a way that directly infringes at least claim 1 of the ’749 Patent.

71. Defendant has had knowledge of the ’749 Patent and of its infringement of the ’749 Patent at least as of February 9, 2012. *See* Exhibit 6. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’749 Patent and of its infringement of the ’749 at least via Defendant’s disclosure of the ’749 Patent during Defendant’s prosecution of U.S. Patent Application No. 13/716,675 (which issued as U.S. Patent No. 9,185,148) via a December 17, 2012 Information Disclosure Statement. Alternatively, on information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’749 Patent and of its infringement of the ’749 Patent at least through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Original Complaint in the Samsung Case and/or through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Infringement Contentions in the Samsung Case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’749 Patent, and its infringement of the ’749 Patent, at least since sometime before July 2, 2025, when Defendant filed IPR2025-01181, 1182, and 1103, challenging the validity of the `918 Patent, the ’344 Patent, and the ’971 Patent, respectively (each of which is related to the ’749 Patent) and referencing the Samsung Case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’749 Patent and of its infringement of the ’749 Patent at least through receipt of this First Amended Complaint.

72. On information and belief, despite Defendant’s knowledge of the ’749 Patent and of its infringement of the ’749 Patent, Defendant has not sought to remedy its infringement or sought to identify any good faith belief as to why it does not infringe the ’749 Patent.

73. On information and belief, Defendant’s actions represented a specific intent to induce infringement of at least claim 1 of the ’749 Patent. For example, Defendant offered its

customers extensive customer support and instructions that instructed and encouraged its customers to infringe the '749 Patent via at least their use of the Accused Products. *See, e.g.,* materials cited in Exhibit 7; https://support.google.com/android/answer/15992026?hl=en, https://support.google.com/android/answer/3265955?hl=en, and https://support.google.com/android/answer/6160491?hl=en-GB#:~:text=If%20you%20lose%20an%20Android,Is%20visible%20on%20Google%20Play (exemplar Find Hub support pages).

74. In addition, by receiving notice of the '749 Patent and Defendant's infringement thereof, Defendant obtained a subjective belief that there is a high probability that the Accused Products infringe the '749 Patent. Despite being put on notice of infringement, on information and belief Defendant has not taken actions to avoid the conduct alleged to infringe, has not offered any reasons as to why Defendant does not infringe the '749 Patent, and has not sought to remedy its infringements by offering to take a license. Defendant's failure to act reflects deliberate actions to avoid learning that the Accused Products infringe the '749 Patent and, more generally, a policy of not earnestly reviewing and respecting the intellectual property of others.

75. Since issuance of the '749 Patent, and prior to Defendant having notice of infringement, neither SCT nor its predecessors or licensees have made, offered for sale, sold, or imported a product that practices any claim of the '749 Patent or that would otherwise require marking under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

76. SCT may recover pre-suit damages for Defendant's infringement of the '749 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

77. As a result of Defendant's infringement of the '749 Patent, SCT has suffered and is owed monetary damages adequate to compensate it for the infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

78. Defendant's activities have been willful, egregious, wanton, and deliberate in disregard to SCT's rights, justifying a finding of willful infringement, enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT II – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '918 PATENT

79. SCT incorporates herein the allegations made in paragraphs 1 through 78.

80. Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the '918 Patent, including, for example, claims 1 and 9, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States infringing products including, but not limited to, the Accused Products.

81. Exemplary claim charts demonstrating Defendant's infringement of the '918 Patent are attached as Exhibits 8-10 and incorporated herein by reference.

82. Additionally, Defendant has indirectly infringed the '918 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least by inducing customers to purchase the Accused Products and/or by instructing customers how to use the Accused Products in a way that directly infringes at least claims 1 and 9 of the '918 Patent.

83. On information and belief, as discussed *supra,* Defendant has had, or should have had, knowledge of the '918 Patent as of May 17, 2022, the date the '918 Patent issued, based on Defendant's knowledge of related patents and publications, including but not limited to, the '359

Patent, the ’749 Patent, and U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2010/0061294 and 2011/0300802.

84. Alternatively, on information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’918 Patent and of its infringement of the ’918 Patent at least through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Original Complaint in the Samsung Case and/or through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Infringement Contentions in the Samsung Case, in which SCT identified how the Accused Products in that case (including products that utilize Google’s Android operating system) infringe claims of the ’918 Patent. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the `918 Patent, and its infringement of the `918 Patent, at least since sometime before July 2, 2025, when Defendant filed IPR2025-01181 challenging the validity of the `918 Patent and referencing the Samsung Case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the `918 Patent, and its infringement of the `918 Patent, through the filing of SCT’s Original Complaint in this case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’918 Patent and of its infringement of the ’918 Patent at least through receipt of the Original Complaint in this matter, which was filed on August 4, 2025.

85. On information and belief, despite Defendant’s knowledge of the ’918 Patent and of its infringement of the ’918 Patent, Defendant has not sought to remedy its infringement or sought to identify any good faith belief as to why it does not infringe the ’918 Patent.

86. On information and belief, Defendant’s actions represented a specific intent to induce infringement of at least claims 1 and 9 of the ’918 Patent. For example, Defendant offered its customers extensive customer support and instructions that instructed and encouraged its customers to infringe the ’918 Patent via at least their use of the Accused Products. *See, e.g.,* materials cited in Exhibits 8-10; https://support.google.com/android/answer/9286773?hl=en and https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728591?hl=en (exemplar support pages for Quick

Share);

https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728092?hl=en#:~:text=Tap%20Location%20.,nearby%20devices%20on%20or%20off. (exemplar support page for Fast Pair); https://support.google.com/android/answer/15992026?hl=en, https://support.google.com/android/answer/3265955?hl=en, and https://support.google.com/android/answer/6160491?hl=en-GB#:~:text=If%20you%20lose%20an%20Android,Is%20visible%20on%20Google%20Play (exemplar Find Hub support pages).

87. In addition, by receiving notice of the '918 Patent and Defendant's infringement thereof, Defendant obtained a subjective belief that there is a high probability that the Accused Products infringe the '918 Patent. Despite being put on notice of infringement, on information and belief Defendant has not taken actions to avoid the conduct alleged to infringe, has not offered any reasons as to why Defendant does not infringe the '918 Patent, and has not sought to remedy its infringements by offering to take a license. Defendant's failure to act reflects deliberate actions to avoid learning that the Accused Products infringe the '918 Patent and, more generally, a policy of not earnestly reviewing and respecting the intellectual property of others.

88. Since issuance of the '918 Patent, and prior to Defendant having notice of infringement, neither SCT nor its predecessors or licensees have made, offered for sale, sold, or imported a product that practices any claim of the '918 Patent or that would otherwise require marking under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

89. SCT may recover pre-suit damages for Defendant's infringement of the '918 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

90. As a result of Defendant's infringement of the '918 Patent, SCT has suffered and is owed monetary damages adequate to compensate it for the infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

91. Defendant's activities have been willful, egregious, wanton, and deliberate in disregard to SCT's rights, justifying a finding of willful infringement, enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT III – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '344 PATENT

92. SCT incorporates herein the allegations made in paragraphs 1 through 91.

93. Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the '344 Patent, including, for example, claims 1, 29, and 30, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States infringing products including, but not limited to, the Accused Products.

94. Exemplary claim charts demonstrating Defendant's infringement of the '344 Patent are attached as Exhibits 11-13 and incorporated herein by reference.

95. Additionally, Defendant has indirectly infringed the '344 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least by inducing customers to purchase the Accused Products and/or by instructing customers how to use the Accused Products in a way that directly infringes at least claims 1, 29, and 30 of the '344 Patent.

96. On information and belief, as discussed *supra,* Defendant has had, or should have had, knowledge of the '344 Patent as of September 13, 2022, the date the '344 Patent issued, based on Defendant's knowledge of related patents and publications, including but not limited to, the '359 Patent, the '749 Patent, and U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2010/0061294 and 2011/0300802.

97. Alternatively, on information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’344 Patent and of its infringement of the ’344 Patent at least through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Original Complaint in the Samsung Case and/or through receipt or knowledge of SCT’s Infringement Contentions in the Samsung Case, in which SCT identified how the Accused Products in that case (including products that utilize Google’s Android operating system) infringe claims of the ’344 Patent. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’344 Patent, and its infringement of the ’344 Patent, at least since sometime before July 2, 2025, when Defendant filed IPR2025-01182 challenging the validity of the ’344 Patent and referencing the Samsung Case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ’344 Patent and of its infringement of the ’344 Patent at least through receipt of the Original Complaint in this matter, which was filed on August 4, 2025.

98. On information and belief, despite Defendant’s knowledge of the ’344 Patent and of its infringement of the ’344 Patent, Defendant has not sought to remedy its infringement or sought to identify any good faith belief as to why it does not infringe the ’344 Patent.

99. On information and belief, Defendant’s actions represented a specific intent to induce infringement of at least claims 1, 29, and 30 of the ’344 Patent. For example, Defendant offered its customers extensive customer support and instructions that instructed and encouraged its customers to infringe the ’344 Patent via at least their use of the Accused Products. *See, e.g.,* materials cited in Exhibits 11-13; https://support.google.com/android/answer/9286773?hl=en and https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728591?hl=en (exemplar support pages for Quick Share); https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728092?hl=en#:~:text=Tap%20Location%20.,nearby%20devices%20on%20or%20off. (exemplar support page for Fast Pair);

https://support.google.com/android/answer/15992026?hl=en, https://support.google.com/android/answer/3265955?hl=en, and https://support.google.com/android/answer/6160491?hl=en-GB#:~:text=If%20you%20lose%20an%20Android,Is%20visible%20on%20Google%20Play (exemplar Find Hub support pages).

100. In addition, by receiving notice of the ’344 Patent and Defendant’s infringement thereof, Defendant obtained a subjective belief that there is a high probability that the Accused Products infringe the ’344 Patent. Despite being put on notice of infringement, on information and belief Defendant has not taken actions to avoid the conduct alleged to infringe, has not offered any reasons as to why Defendant does not infringe the ’344 Patent, and has not sought to remedy its infringements by offering to take a license. Defendant’s failure to act reflects deliberate actions to avoid learning that the Accused Products infringe the ’344 Patent and, more generally, a policy of not earnestly reviewing and respecting the intellectual property of others.

101. Since issuance of the ’344 Patent, and prior to Defendant having notice of infringement, neither SCT nor its predecessors or licensees have made, offered for sale, sold, or imported a product that practices any claim of the ’344 Patent or that would otherwise require marking under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

102. SCT may recover pre-suit damages for Defendant’s infringement of the ’344 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

103. As a result of Defendant’s infringement of the ’344 Patent, SCT has suffered and is owed monetary damages adequate to compensate it for the infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

104. Defendant's activities have been willful, egregious, wanton, and deliberate in disregard to SCT's rights, justifying a finding of willful infringement, enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT IV – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '971 PATENT

105. SCT incorporates herein the allegations made in paragraphs 1 through 104.

106. Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the '971 Patent, including, for example, claims 1, 37, and 50, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States infringing products including, but not limited to, the Accused Products.

107. Exemplary claim charts demonstrating Defendant's infringement of the '971 Patent are attached as Exhibits 14-16 and incorporated herein by reference.

108. Additionally, Defendant has indirectly infringed the '971 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least by inducing customers to purchase the Accused Products and/or by instructing customers how to use the Accused Products in a way that directly infringes at least claims 1, 37, and 50 of the '971 Patent.

109. On information and belief, as discussed *supra,* Defendant has had, or should have had, knowledge of the '971 Patent as of June 27, 2023, the date the '971 Patent issued, based on Defendant's knowledge of related patents and publications, including but not limited to, the '359 Patent, the '749 Patent, and U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2010/0061294 and 2011/0300802.

110. Alternatively, on information and belief, Defendant has had knowledge of the '971 Patent and of its infringement of the '971 Patent at least through receipt or knowledge of SCT's

Original Complaint in the Samsung Case and/or through receipt or knowledge of SCT's Infringement Contentions in the Samsung Case, in which SCT identified how the Accused Products in that case (including products that utilize Google's Android operating system) infringe claims of the '971 Patent. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the ``971 Patent, and its infringement of the ``971 Patent, at least since sometime before July 2, 2025, when Defendant filed IPR2025-01183 challenging the validity of the ``971 Patent and referencing the Samsung Case. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the '971 Patent and of its infringement of the '971 Patent at least through receipt of the Original Complaint in this matter, which was filed on August 4, 2025.

111. On information and belief, despite Defendant's knowledge of the '971 Patent and of its infringement of the '971 Patent, Defendant has not sought to remedy its infringement or sought to identify any good faith belief as to why it does not infringe the '971 Patent.

112. On information and belief, Defendant's actions represented a specific intent to induce infringement of at least claims 1, 37, and 50 of the '971 Patent. For example, Defendant offered its customers extensive customer support and instructions that instructed and encouraged its customers to infringe the '971 Patent via at least their use of the Accused Products. *See, e.g.,* materials cited in Exhibits 14-16; https://support.google.com/android/answer/9286773?hl=en and https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728591?hl=en (exemplar support pages for Quick Share); https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728092?hl=en#:~:text=Tap%20Location%20.,nearby%20devices%20on%20or%20off. (exemplar support page for Fast Pair); https://support.google.com/android/answer/15992026?hl=en, https://support.google.com/android/answer/3265955?hl=en, and

https://support.google.com/android/answer/6160491?hl=en-GB#:~:text=If%20you%20lose%20an%20Android,Is%20visible%20on%20Google%20Play (exemplar Find Hub support pages).

113. In addition, by receiving notice of the ’971 Patent and Defendant’s infringement thereof, Defendant obtained a subjective belief that there is a high probability that the Accused Products infringe the ’971 Patent. Despite being put on notice of infringement, on information and belief Defendant has not taken actions to avoid the conduct alleged to infringe, has not offered any reasons as to why Defendant does not infringe the ’971 Patent, and has not sought to remedy its infringements by offering to take a license. Defendant’s failure to act reflects deliberate actions to avoid learning that the Accused Products infringe the ’971 Patent and, more generally, a policy of not earnestly reviewing and respecting the intellectual property of others.

114. Since issuance of the ’971 Patent, and prior to Defendant having notice of infringement, neither SCT nor its predecessors or licensees have made, offered for sale, sold, or imported a product that practices any claim of the ’971 Patent or that would otherwise require marking under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

115. SCT may recover pre-suit damages for Defendant’s infringement of the ’971 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

116. As a result of Defendant’s infringement of the ’971 Patent, SCT has suffered and is owed monetary damages adequate to compensate it for the infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

117. Defendant’s activities have been willful, egregious, wanton, and deliberate in disregard to SCT’s rights, justifying a finding of willful infringement, enhanced damages under

35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT V – INFRINGEMENT OF THE '685 PATENT

118. SCT incorporates herein the allegations made in paragraphs 1 through 117.

119. Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of the '685 Patent, including, for example, claim 1, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a) by making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing into the United States infringing products including, but not limited to, the Accused Products.

120. An exemplary claim chart demonstrating Defendant's infringement of the '685 Patent is attached as Exhibit 17 and incorporated herein by reference.

121. Additionally, Defendant has indirectly infringed the '685 Patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) at least by inducing customers to purchase the Accused Products and/or by instructing customers how to use the Accused Products in a way that directly infringes at least claim 1 of the '685 Patent.

122. On information and belief, as discussed *supra,* Defendant has had, or should have had, knowledge of the '685 Patent as of May 28, 2024, the date the '685 Patent issued, based on Defendant's knowledge of related patents and publications, including but not limited to, the '359 Patent, the '749 Patent, and U.S. Patent Application Publication Nos. 2010/0061294 and 2011/0300802.

123. Alternatively, Defendant has had knowledge of the '685 Patent and of its infringement of the '685 Patent at least through receipt or knowledge of this First Amended Complaint.

124. On information and belief, despite Defendant's knowledge of the '685 Patent and of its infringement of the '685 Patent, Defendant has not sought to remedy its infringement or sought to identify any good faith belief as to why it does not infringe the '685 Patent.

125. On information and belief, Defendant's actions represented a specific intent to induce infringement of at least claim 1 of the '685 Patent. For example, Defendant offered its customers extensive customer support and instructions that instructed and encouraged its customers to infringe the '685 Patent via at least their use of the Accused Products. *See, e.g.,* materials cited in Exhibit 17; https://support.google.com/android/answer/15728092?hl=en#:~:text=Tap%20Location%20.,nearby%20devices%20on%20or%20off. (exemplar support page for Fast Pair).

126. In addition, by receiving notice of the '685 Patent and Defendant's infringement thereof, Defendant obtained a subjective belief that there is a high probability that the Accused Products infringe the '685 Patent. Despite being put on notice of infringement, on information and belief Defendant has not taken actions to avoid the conduct alleged to infringe, has not offered any reasons as to why Defendant does not infringe the '685 Patent, and has not sought to remedy its infringements by offering to take a license. Defendant's failure to act reflects deliberate actions to avoid learning that the Accused Products infringe the '685 Patent and, more generally, a policy of not earnestly reviewing and respecting the intellectual property of others.

127. Since issuance of the '685 Patent, and prior to Defendant having notice of infringement, neither SCT nor its predecessors or licensees have made, offered for sale, sold, or imported a product that practices any claim of the '685 Patent or that would otherwise require marking under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

128. SCT may recover pre-suit damages for Defendant's infringement of the '685 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 287.

129. As a result of Defendant's infringement of the '685 Patent, SCT has suffered and is owed monetary damages adequate to compensate it for the infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 284, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty.

130. Defendant's activities have been willful, egregious, wanton, and deliberate in disregard to SCT's rights, justifying a finding of willful infringement, enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, SCT demands a trial by jury on all issues triable of right by a jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, SCT respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in its favor and grant the following relief:

a. A judgment that Defendant has directly infringed one or more claims of each of the Patents-in-Suit;

b. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay SCT past and future damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including for supplemental damages arising from any infringements not accounted for in the verdict, including any pre-verdict infringements not accounted for in the verdict and any continuing post-verdict infringement for the time between trial and entry of the final judgment, with an accounting, as needed, as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 284;

SCT Exhibit 2017
IPR2025-01181

c. A judgment and order that Defendant has willfully infringed the Patents-in-Suit and requiring Defendant to pay SCT enhanced damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285;

d. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay SCT reasonable ongoing royalties on a going-forward basis after final judgment;

e. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay SCT pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages award;

f. A judgment and order requiring Defendant to pay SCT's costs; and

g. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: September 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Timothy E. Grochocinski
Timothy E. Grochocinski
Illinois Bar No. 6295055
tim@nelbum.com
Charles Austin Ginnings
Illinois Bar No. 6343678
austin@nelbum.com
Taryn N. Trusty
Illinois Bar No. 6344409
taryn@nelbum.com
NELSON BUMGARDNER CONROY PC
745 McClintock Drive, Suite 340
Burr Ridge, Illinois 60527
708.675.1974 (telephone)

Brent Bumgardner
Texas Bar No. 00795272
brent@nelbum.com
Christopher G. Granaghan
Texas Bar No. 24078585
chris@nelbum.com
NELSON BUMGARDNER CONROY P.C.
3131 West Seventh Street, Suite 300
Fort Worth, Texas 76107
Telephone: (817) 377-9111

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Secure Communication Technologies, LLC