

1 Christopher S. Marchese (SBN 170239)
marchese@fr.com
2 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
4695 MacArthur Court, Suite 1100
3 Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel: (949) 623-7640 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

4 John W. Thornburgh (SBN 154627)
thornburgh@fr.com
5 Madelyn S. McCormick (SBN 320063)
mmccormick@fr.com
6 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
7 San Diego, CA 92130
8 Tel: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-5099

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10 *Dolby Laboratories, Inc.,*
Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corp.,
11 *and Dolby International AB*

12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13
14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

15 DOLBY LABORATORIES, INC.,
16 DOLBY LABORATORIES
17 LICENSING CORP., AND DOLBY
INTERNATIONAL AB,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20
21 INTERDIGITAL, INC.,
22 INTERDIGITAL MADISON PATENT
23 HOLDINGS, SAS, AND
INTERDIGITAL VC HOLDINGS,
INC.,

24 Defendants.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
JUDGMENT OF
NONINFRINGEMENT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL ONLY
TO THE EXTENT THERE ARE
ANY ISSUES TRIABLE TO A JURY
AND OTHERWISE REQUEST A
BENCH TRIAL**

25
26
27
28 InterDigital EX2009
Dolby v. InterDigital
IPR2026-00252

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

1 Dolby Laboratories, Inc. (“Dolby Laboratories”), Dolby Laboratories
 2 Licensing Corporation (“Dolby Licensing”), and Dolby International AB (“Dolby
 3 International”) (collectively, “Dolby”), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby
 4 file this Complaint for a Declaratory Judgment against Defendants InterDigital, Inc.,
 5 Interdigital Madison Patent Holdings, SAS, and InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc.
 6 (collectively, “InterDigital”), and allege as follows:

7 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

8 1. Dolby seeks a declaration of non-infringement of U.S. Patent
 9 Nos. 8,149,338 (the “’338 Patent”); 9,654,751 (the “’751 Patent”); 9,747,674 (the
 10 “’674 Patent”); 10,741,211 (the “’211 Patent”); and 11,399,168 (the “’168 Patent”),
 11 referred to collectively as the “Patents-in-Suit.” True and correct copies of the
 12 Patents-in-Suit are attached as **Exhibits 1** through **5**.

13 2. Neither Dolby, Dolby Vision, nor its customers using Dolby Vision
 14 infringe or have infringed, either directly or indirectly, any claim of any of the Patents-
 15 in-Suit.

16 3. Dolby seeks this relief because InterDigital has pursued a coordinated
 17 enforcement campaign targeting Dolby’s product, Dolby Vision, by suing Dolby’s
 18 downstream customers in no less than seven separate actions in multiple jurisdictions
 19 across the country based on their alleged use of Dolby Vision.

20 4. Over the past few months, InterDigital filed actions against Dolby’s
 21 customers Amazon.com Services LLC (“Amazon”), TCL Industries Holdings Co.,
 22 Ltd. *et al.* (“TCL”), and Hisense Co., Ltd. *et al.* (“Hisense”), in several district courts
 23 and the International Trade Commission (“ITC”), alleging that Dolby’s customers’
 24 use of Dolby Vision or incorporation of Dolby vision into Dolby’s customers’ alleged
 25 products infringes at least one of the Patents-in-Suit in each of these actions:

- 26 • November 2025: *InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. Amazon.Com Services LLC*, No.
 27 1:25-cv-01365-GBW (D. Del.), Dkt. No. 1 (the “Amazon DE Complaint”)
 28 (’211 and ’674 Patents);

- 1 • December 2025: *InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. Amazon.Com Services LLC*, No. 2:25-cv-00822-AWA-DEM (E.D. Va.), Dkt. No. 1 (the “Amazon EDVA
- 2 Complaint”) (’338 Patent);
- 3
- 4 • December 2025: *Certain Video-Capable Electronic Devices*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1481 (U.S. Int’l Trade Comm’n), Complaint (the “Amazon ITC
- 5 Complaint”) (’211 and ’674 Patents);
- 6
- 7 • February 2026: *InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. TCL Industries Holdings Co., Ltd. et*
- 8 *al.*, No. 2:26-cv-00101-JRG (E.D. Tex.), Dkt. No. 1 (the “TCL EDTX
- 9 Complaint”) (’751 and ’168 Patents);
- 10 • February 2026: *InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. Hisense Co., Ltd. et al.*, No. 1:26-cv-
- 11 00754-SEG (N.D. Ga.), Dkt. No. 1 (the “Hisense NDGA Complaint”) (’751
- 12 and ’168 Patents); and
- 13 • February 2026: *Certain Video-Capable Electronic Devices, Including Smart*
- 14 *Televisions, Monitors, and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-3889 (U.S.
- 15 Int’l Trade Comm’n), Complaint, (the “TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint”) (’751
- 16 and ’168 Patents)
- 17 (collectively, the “Customer Complaints”).

18 5. In each of these cases, at least one of InterDigital’s purported

19 infringement claim charts attached to the Customer Complaints alleges infringement

20 based on Dolby’s customers’ use of Dolby Vision as provided by Dolby. **Exhibits 6-**

21 **18.** For patents in the Customer Complaints that overlap—namely, the ’211 Patent

22 and the ’674 Patent are asserted in both the Delaware and ITC suits against Amazon,

23 and the ’751 Patent and the ’168 Patent are asserted in the TCL EDTX Complaint, the

24 Hisense NDGA Complaint, and the TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint—the accompanying

25 claim chart allegations were substantially identical to each other.

26 6. As part of its enforcement campaign, InterDigital also sued Dolby’s

27 downstream customer The Walt Disney Company (“Disney”) and related Disney

28 entities in this District and accuses them of patent infringement by virtue of their

1 alleged use of Dolby Vision, as incorporated into various Disney video streaming
2 products such as Disney+ and Hulu. *See InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. The Walt Disney*
3 *Company et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-00895-WLH-BFM (C.D. Cal.), Dkt. No. 1 (the “Disney
4 Complaint”). InterDigital alleges, among other things, that Disney’s use of Dolby
5 Vision infringes the asserted U.S. Patent No. 9,185,268 (the “’268 Patent”). *See, e.g.,*
6 *Disney Complaint*, ¶¶ 523–48; **Exhibit 19** (Disney Complaint ’268 patent purported
7 infringement claim chart).

8 7. InterDigital’s enforcement campaign against Dolby’s customers also
9 extends to global forums. For example, InterDigital sued Disney in Munich Regional
10 Court, asserting Disney infringed a European counterpart to the ’268 Patent,
11 EP2132923 (“Germany Injunction Suit”). As part of the Germany Injunction Suit,
12 InterDigital sought and received an injunction in November 2025 against Disney’s
13 use of implicated technology, which, on information and belief, led Disney to disable
14 Dolby Vision in Germany.

15 8. Dolby is concurrently filing a declaratory judgement action in this Court
16 for non-infringement and invalidity of the ’268 Patent, which InterDigital has asserted
17 against Disney for its use of Dolby Vision. The Disney litigation was filed earlier
18 than the litigations against Amazon, TCL, and Hisense, and Dolby has thus included
19 the ’268 Patent in a separate declaratory judgment action.

20 9. InterDigital’s actions and allegations, including multiple lawsuits against
21 Dolby customers Disney, Amazon, TCL, and Hisense related to incorporation and use
22 of Dolby Vision, have injured and continue to injure Dolby’s business and business
23 relationships thereby creating a concrete, actual, and immediate justiciable
24 controversy between Dolby and InterDigital.

25 10. Accordingly, Dolby brings this case to defend its technology, clear
26 InterDigital’s allegations that Dolby and its product Dolby Vision infringe the
27 Patents-in-Suit, and to protect its customers, including Amazon, TCL and Hisense,
28 from baseless claims of patent infringement. Dolby seeks a judicial declaration that

1 its product Dolby Vision, and the use of Dolby Vision as instructed by Dolby does
2 not infringe the Patents-in-Suit directly or indirectly.

3 **PARTIES**

4 11. Plaintiff Dolby Laboratories is a Delaware corporation with its
5 headquarters at 1275 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103. Dolby
6 Laboratories develops and owns the Dolby Vision technology.

7 12. Plaintiff Dolby Licensing is a New York corporation with its
8 headquarters at 1275 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103. Dolby
9 Licensing is an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of Dolby Laboratories. Dolby
10 Licensing licenses Dolby Vision to third parties.

11 13. Plaintiff Dolby International is a Swedish private limited company with
12 its headquarters at 77 Sir John Rogerson's Quay, Spaces South Docklands, Dublin
13 D02 VK60, Ireland. Dolby International is an indirect, wholly-owned subsidiary of
14 Dolby Laboratories.

15 14. On information and belief, Defendant InterDigital, Inc. is a Pennsylvania
16 corporation with its principal place of business at 200 Bellevue Parkway, Suite 300,
17 Wilmington, DE 19809. Also on information and belief, InterDigital makes no
18 products, including products that embody the claims of the Patents-in-Suit, and
19 acquired at least four of the Patents-in-Suit from others rather than developing the
20 Patents-in-Suit technology itself.

21 15. On information and belief, Defendant InterDigital Madison Patent
22 Holdings, SAS is a French société par actions simplifiée (simplified joint stock
23 company) with its principal place of business at 3 Rue du Colonel Moll, Paris, France
24 75017, and is a wholly owned subsidiary of InterDigital, Inc.

25 16. On information and belief, Defendant InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc. is
26 a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 200 Bellevue Parkway,
27 Suite 300, Wilmington, DE 19809. On information and belief, InterDigital VC
28 Holdings, Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of InterDigital, Inc.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17. This action arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, *et seq.*, and under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*

18. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 2201 based on a definite and concrete, real and substantial, justiciable controversy between Dolby, on the one hand, and InterDigital, on the other hand, for declaratory judgment of patent non-infringement.

19. This Court has personal jurisdiction over InterDigital because InterDigital has purposely conducted its patent enforcement activities in California and in particular directed its patent enforcement activities at Dolby in California and this District, including by filing a lawsuit in the Central District of California where it has targeted and alleged infringement of the '268 Patent based on use of Dolby Vision by Dolby's customer, Disney. *See InterDigital, Inc. et al. v. The Walt Disney Company et al.*, No. 2:25-CV-00895-WLH-BFM (C.D. Cal.), Disney Complaint, ¶¶ 523–48. InterDigital has further purposefully availed itself of this forum by compelling discovery directly from Dolby in California concerning Dolby Vision as part of its enforcement campaign.

20. InterDigital has further directed its enforcement activities to Dolby in California by suing Dolby's customers, Disney, Amazon, TCL, and Hisense for their alleged use of Dolby Vision. *See* Disney Complaint, Amazon DE Complaint; Amazon ITC Complaint; Amazon EDVA Complaint; TCL EDTX Complaint, Hisense NDGA complaint; and TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint. InterDigital knew or should have known that its infringement allegations in each Customer Complaint based on Dolby Vision would cause harm to Dolby in California, where Dolby is headquartered and where Dolby designed, developed, licenses, and supports Dolby Vision. InterDigital's infringement allegations expressly identify Dolby Vision by name, rely on Dolby Vision specifications, workflows, and documentation, and attach claim charts grounded in Dolby Vision materials originating from Dolby in

1 California, including in this District. InterDigital thus knew or should have known
 2 that any resulting injury would be felt by Dolby in California. InterDigital's Customer
 3 Complaints were thus expressly aimed at California and at Dolby's California-based
 4 conduct.

5 21. Dolby maintains a substantial and long-standing physical presence in this
 6 District, including a large office facility in Burbank located in the heart of the Los
 7 Angeles entertainment industry, adjacent to major film and television production
 8 centers, and expressly intended to serve Dolby's extensive Los Angeles-based client
 9 base. *See, e.g.,* <https://www.mixonline.com/recording/dolby-opens-new-la-office-372811>
 10 (last visited March 3, 2026). Additionally, the "Dolby Theatre" is located on
 11 Hollywood Boulevard in Los Angeles, and Dolby Screening Rooms are located on
 12 Alameda Avenue in Burbank and on Hollywood Boulevard in Los Angeles.

13 22. InterDigital is further subject to personal jurisdiction in California
 14 because of InterDigital's activities in California. First, InterDigital has at least two
 15 facilities in California. On information and belief, InterDigital has an office located
 16 at 9276 Scranton Road, Suite 300, San Diego, California, and an office located at
 17 4410 El Camino Real, Suite 120, Los Altos, California. Indeed, Plaintiff InterDigital,
 18 Inc. is advertising several job openings in its Los Altos, California offices.
 19 [https://www.linkedin.com/jobs/interdigital-inc.-jobs-](https://www.linkedin.com/jobs/interdigital-inc.-jobs-worldwide?f_C=17752&trk=job-results_see-all-jobs-link&position=1&pageNum=0)
 20 [worldwide?f_C=17752&trk=job-results_see-all-jobs-link&position=1&pageNum=0](https://www.linkedin.com/jobs/interdigital-inc.-jobs-worldwide?f_C=17752&trk=job-results_see-all-jobs-link&position=1&pageNum=0)
 21 (last visited March 3, 2026). Second, on information and belief, an affiliate of the
 22 InterDigital Defendants, InterDigital Communications, Inc. ("ICI"), is a Delaware
 23 corporation that is registered as a "stock corporation" in California and has an agent
 24 for service of process (CT Corp.) in Glendale, California.
 25 <https://bizfileonline.sos.ca.gov/search/business> (last visited March 3, 2026). ICI
 26 shares the same principal address as the headquarters of Defendant InterDigital, Inc.

27 23. InterDigital has purposefully availed itself of the privilege of conducting
 28 its business of licensing patents in California, and in particular within this District,

1 through extensive, deliberate, and ongoing commercial, licensing, partnership, and
2 marketing activities directed to this forum. On information and belief, InterDigital
3 has entered into and maintained patent license agreements with numerous
4 California-based companies headquartered or operating in this District, including
5 Sony (through Sony Pictures, headquartered in Culver City, CA), Google (with
6 offices in Los Angeles, Irvine, and Playa Vista), Samsung Electronics (through
7 Samsung Research America facilities in Irvine and Valencia), Alps Alpine (with an
8 office in Torrance, CA), Sharp (with an office in Irvine), and Vizio (headquartered in
9 Irvine). On information and belief, InterDigital has also formed strategic partnerships
10 centered in Southern California, including a 2026 launch of a “Haptic Excellence
11 Center” with Razer, which is dual-headquartered in Irvine, California, and a
12 long-standing collaboration with EvoNexus to promote technology innovation and
13 entrepreneurship in Southern California. In addition, on information and belief,
14 InterDigital has demonstrated technologies in Los Angeles, including presenting at
15 the SIGGRAPH conference at the Los Angeles Convention Center and delivering
16 technical presentations at UCLA.

17 24. Thus, the citizens of the State of California and this District have a
18 substantial interest in the outcome of this dispute.

19 25. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) because
20 events giving rise to Dolby’s claims occurred here, including: development and
21 testing work on Dolby Vision at Dolby’s facilities in this District; InterDigital’s suit
22 against Dolby’s customer Disney in this District alleging infringement based on
23 Dolby Vision; and Dolby’s collaboration and outreach with Dolby customers in the
24 District. Dolby incorporates by reference Paragraphs 19-24 with respect to venue.

25 26. Portions of the original development and testing of Dolby Vision were
26 conducted at Dolby’s facilities and laboratory located at 3601 West Alameda Ave.,
27 Burbank, California, within this District. Dolby also maintains facilities at 3601 West
28 Alameda Ave., Burbank, California, and 6321 Hollywood Blvd., Los Angeles,

1 California, where Dolby Vision work, demonstrations, and evaluation activities have
2 taken place and continue to occur.

3 27. Many of Dolby's content creation customers for Dolby Vision are
4 located in this District, including Disney Studios (Burbank), Product Factory
5 (Burbank), Amazon MGM Studios (Culver City, CA), Red Bull Media House North
6 America (Santa Monica, CA), Paramount Pictures (Hollywood, Los Angeles, CA),
7 and Apple Originals (Culver City, CA). Dolby also has active Dolby Vision licenses
8 with customers in this District. Additionally, many Dolby Certified Professionals,
9 those who have gone through Dolby's training program, are located in this District.
10 See, e.g., [https://professional.dolby.com/content-creation/dolby-vision-certified-](https://professional.dolby.com/content-creation/dolby-vision-certified-professionals/)
11 [professionals/](https://professional.dolby.com/content-creation/dolby-vision-certified-professionals/).

12 28. Venue is further proper in this District because Dolby personnel with
13 knowledge of the accused Dolby Vision technology work and reside in this District.
14 There are currently about 90 Dolby employees at Dolby's 3601 West Alameda Ave.,
15 Burbank, California location, which includes employees who work on and support
16 Dolby Vision and a Dolby Vision content creation team.

17 29. InterDigital has engaged in patent licensing discussions with Disney in
18 this District. InterDigital's Disney Complaint states in Paragraph 3 that "in July 2022
19 InterDigital reached out to Disney [located in this District] to request that the parties
20 discuss the licensing of InterDigital's patented technologies used by Disney."
21 Disney's answer/counterclaims states in Paragraph 59 that "Disney has attempted to
22 continue negotiating. On February 19, 2025, Disney sent InterDigital a letter offering
23 to engage in licensing negotiations and requesting that InterDigital 'propose a license
24 on a worldwide, non-discriminatory basis and on reasonable terms and conditions
25 consistent with ITU RAND policies and Thomson's (and InterDigital's)
26 commitments to the ITU.'" Disney continues in Paragraph 60: "InterDigital has
27 refused to provide such an offer. Instead, on February 28, 2025, InterDigital sent a
28 letter refusing to provide an offer to license its patents on RAND terms."

1 30. On information and belief, relevant witnesses and evidence concerning
2 the Patents-in-Suit, including one or more named inventors of the Patents-in-Suit,
3 previously resided in California, and particularly in this District, and evidence
4 concerning their work on the inventions may still exist in this District. *See, e.g.*, '338
5 Patent, '751 Patent. The '338 Patent lists one inventor (Pierre Ollivier) in Culver
6 City, California, within this District. The '751 Patent lists several inventors within
7 this District: Ingo Tobias Doser (Burbank), Xueming Henry Gu (Calabasas), Michael
8 Allan Sterling (Westlake Village), and Bongsun Lee (La Crescenta). On information
9 and belief, at least Dr. Gu still resides in this District.

10 31. The declaratory and injunctive relief sought in this action would resolve
11 InterDigital's infringement allegations concerning Dolby Vision and directly affect
12 Dolby's California-based business operations and customer relationships, further
13 supporting venue in this District.

14 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

15 32. Dolby Vision is a high dynamic range ("HDR") video technology
16 developed and owned by Dolby. Dolby makes Dolby Vision available to third parties
17 through licensing arrangements under which customers implement the technology in
18 their products and services in accordance with Dolby's specifications.

19 33. InterDigital claims to own all relevant rights, title, and interest in the
20 Patents-in-Suit. On information and belief, InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc. claims to
21 own all rights, title, and interest in the '211 and '674 Patents, and claims to hold all
22 substantial rights pertinent to this suit, including the right to sue and recover for all
23 past, current, and future infringement. *See, e.g.*, Amazon DE Complaint, ¶¶ 30, 39.
24 On information and belief, InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc. claims to own all rights,
25 title, and interest in the '338 Patent, and claims to hold all substantial rights pertinent
26 to this suit, including the right to sue and recover for all past, current, and future
27 infringement. *See, e.g.*, Amazon EDVA Complaint, ¶ 53. On information and belief,
28 InterDigital VC Holdings, Inc. claims to own, by assignment, all rights, title, and

interest in and to the '168 Patent, and claims to hold all substantial rights pertinent to this suit, including the right to sue and recover for all past, current, and future infringement. *See, e.g.*, Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶ 60. On information and belief, InterDigital Madison Patent Holdings SAS claims to own, by assignment, all rights, title, and interest in and to the '751 Patent, and claims to hold all substantial rights pertinent to this suit, including the right to sue and recover for all past, current, and future infringement. *See, e.g.*, Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶ 68.

34. InterDigital attached to each of the Customer Complaints at least one claim chart per Patent-in-Suit, which purports to show that Dolby Vision, its use, or its incorporation into the non-exhaustive lists of Dolby's customers' accused products infringes that particular patent. Collectively, these Customer Complaints charts show that InterDigital contends that Dolby Vision either allegedly infringes, or that the use of Dolby Vision allegedly infringes, the Patents-in-Suit. The claim chart attachments to the Customer Complaints are attached hereto as **Exhibits 6 through 18**, per the table below:

Exhibit Number	InterDigital's Purported Infringement Claim Chart
6	US 8,149,338 (asserted against Amazon, EDVA)
7	US 9,654,751 (asserted against Hisense, NDGA)
8	US 9,654,751 (asserted against TCL, EDTX)
9	US 9,654,751 (asserted against Hisense, ITC)
10	US 9,654,751 (asserted against TCL, ITC)
11	US 9,747,674 (asserted against Amazon, DE)
12	US 9,747,674 (asserted against Amazon, ITC)
13	US 10,741,211 (asserted against Amazon, DE)
14	US 10,741,211 (asserted against Amazon, ITC)
15	US 11,399,168 (asserted against Hisense, NDGA)
16	US 11,399,168 (asserted against TCL, EDTX)
17	US 11,399,168 (asserted against Hisense, ITC)
18	US 11,399,168 (asserted against TCL, ITC)

InterDigital Is Targeting Dolby Vision Through Dolby's Customer Amazon

35. InterDigital has targeted Dolby and its product Dolby Vision by suing Dolby's downstream customer Amazon in three separate jurisdictions: U.S. District

1 Court for the District of Delaware, the ITC, and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern
2 District of Virginia.

3 36. InterDigital asserts overlapping patent infringement allegations against
4 Amazon in the District of Delaware and the ITC, alleging infringement of the '211
5 Patent and the '674 Patent in both jurisdictions based on the same conduct. Because
6 of that overlap, on February 11, 2026, the Delaware court granted Amazon's
7 unopposed motion for a stay pending the determination by the ITC. *InterDigital, Inc.*
8 *et al. v. Amazon.Com Services LLC*, No. 1:25-cv-01365-GBW (D. Del.), Dkt. No. 16.

9 37. Dolby will comply with existing contractual indemnity obligations to
10 Amazon.

11 ***InterDigital's Amazon Suits in DDE and ITC***

12 38. Through its Amazon DE and ITC Complaints, InterDigital seeks to target
13 Dolby by asserting infringement theories for the '211 and '674 Patents centered on
14 Dolby Vision.

15 39. InterDigital attached a claim chart to both the Amazon DE and ITC
16 Complaints for the '211 Patent that references Dolby Vision, accusing Amazon of
17 infringing the '211 Patent by virtue of Amazon's incorporation and use of Dolby
18 Vision in the "HDR Accused Instrumentalities" (i.e., "all Amazon devices capable of
19 playing back HDR10, HDR10+, or Dolby Vision content including at least the
20 following: Fire TV Stick HD, Fire TV Stick 4K Select, Fire TV Stick 4K Plus, Fire
21 TV Stick 4K Max, Fire TV Cube, Fire TV 2-Series, Fire TV 4-Series, and Fire TV
22 Omni Series"). *See* Amazon DE Complaint, ¶¶ 8, 28, 70; **Exhibit 13** at 2 (Amazon
23 DE Complaint '211 Patent purported infringement claim chart); *see also* Amazon ITC
24 Complaint, ¶ 23; **Exhibit 14** (Amazon ITC Complaint '211 Patent purported
25 infringement claim chart).

26 40. InterDigital's Amazon DE and ITC Complaints also attach a claim chart
27 for the '674 Patent that references Dolby Vision, accusing Amazon of infringing the
28 '674 Patent by virtue of Amazon's incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the

1 “HDR Accused Instrumentalities” (i.e., “all Amazon devices that are HDR, HDR10+,
2 or Dolby Vision compliant” or “all Amazon devices capable of playing back HDR,
3 HDR10+, or Dolby Vision content”). *See* Amazon DE Complaint, ¶¶ 8, 28, 80
4 (highlighting Dolby Vision, Dolby Vision logos, and Dolby Vision capabilities in
5 screen shots); **Exhibit 11** at 2 (Amazon DE Complaint ’674 Patent purported
6 infringement claim chart); *see also* **Exhibit 12** (Amazon ITC Complaint ’674 Patent
7 purported infringement claim chart).

8 41. InterDigital’s Amazon DE Complaint claim charts, which are nearly
9 identical in substance to the Amazon ITC Complaint claim charts, confirm that
10 InterDigital’s infringement allegations are directed at Dolby Vision.

11 42. InterDigital alleges in its ’211 Patent claim chart that “[t]he Amazon
12 HDR Accused Instrumentalities are information processing devices” because, for
13 example, “the Fire TV can process HDR content like HDR10, HDR10+, or Dolby
14 Vision.” *See* **Exhibit 13** (Amazon DE Complaint ’211 Patent purported infringement
15 claim chart); **Exhibit 14** (Amazon ITC Complaint ’211 Patent purported infringement
16 claim chart).

17 43. In its ’674 Patent claim chart, InterDigital alleges that the exemplary
18 accused product “can perform conversion of luminance values within a defined
19 dynamic range in accordance with the HDR10+ or Dolby Vision specification.”
20 *See* **Exhibit 11** (Amazon DE Complaint ’674 Patent purported infringement claim
21 chart); **Exhibit 12** (Amazon ITC Complaint ’674 Patent purported infringement claim
22 chart).

23 44. InterDigital does not allege in its Amazon DE Complaint, Amazon ITC
24 Complaint, or the attached claim charts that Amazon uses Dolby Vision or
25 incorporates Dolby Vision into the HDR Accused Instrumentalities in any manner
26 outside of Dolby’s specifications or licensing instructions.

27 45. InterDigital’s conduct outside the four corners of the Amazon DE and
28 Amazon ITC Complaints further confirms that Dolby—not its customers—is the

1 focus of InterDigital’s infringement allegations concerning the ’211 Patent and the
2 ’674 Patent. In connection with its enforcement efforts, InterDigital has issued a
3 third-party subpoena to Dolby as part of InterDigital’s Amazon ITC suit, seeking
4 documents and information relating to Dolby Vision and the ’211 and ’674 Patents.
5 InterDigital’s decision to compel discovery directly from Dolby regarding the ’211
6 and ’674 Patents, including demanding its source code and technical documentation,
7 confirms that InterDigital’s enforcement efforts are directed at Dolby and Dolby
8 Vision, not Amazon, TCL, or Hisense.

9 ***InterDigital’s Amazon Suit in EDVA***

10 46. Through its Amazon EDVA complaint, InterDigital seeks to target
11 Dolby by asserting infringement theories for the ’338 Patent centered on Dolby
12 Vision. InterDigital attached a claim chart for the ’338 Patent that squarely and
13 expressly targets Dolby Vision, accusing Amazon of infringing the ’338 Patent solely
14 by virtue of Amazon’s incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the “HDR Accused
15 Instrumentalities” (i.e., “all Amazon devices that are HDR, HDR10+, or Dolby Vision
16 compliant” or “all Amazon devices that are capable of playing back HDR10,
17 HDR10+, or Dolby Vision content”). See Amazon EDVA Complaint, ¶¶ 8, 30, 84-
18 86; **Exhibit 6** at 2 (Amazon EDVA Complaint ’338 Patent purported infringement
19 claim chart).

20 47. InterDigital’s Amazon EDVA Complaint claim chart for the ’338 Patent
21 confirms that InterDigital’s infringement allegations are directed at Dolby Vision.

22 48. InterDigital alleges in its ’338 Patent claim chart that “[t]he Amazon
23 HDR Accused Services [sic] are capable of performing method [sic] of color
24 correction” because, for example, “the Fire TV can perform color correction in
25 accordance with the Dolby Vision specification” and the Fire TV does “Dolby Vision
26 color correction.” See **Exhibit 6** (Amazon EDVA Complaint ’338 Patent purported
27 infringement claim chart). To support these allegations, InterDigital’s ’338 Patent
28

1 claim chart expressly and repeatedly cites Dolby documentation and materials drawn
2 from Dolby's website for each claim limitation.

3 49. InterDigital does not allege in its Amazon EDVA Complaint or
4 accompanying '338 Patent claim chart that Amazon uses Dolby Vision or
5 incorporates Dolby Vision into the HDR Accused Instrumentalities in any manner
6 outside Dolby's specifications or licensing instructions.

7 **InterDigital is Targeting Dolby Vision Through Dolby's Customers**
8 **TCL and Hisense**

9 50. InterDigital has targeted Dolby and its product Dolby Vision by suing
10 Dolby's downstream customers TCL and Hisense in three separate jurisdictions: the
11 ITC (both TCL and Hisense), U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas
12 (TCL), and the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia (Hisense).

13 51. InterDigital asserts overlapping patent infringement allegations against
14 TCL in the Eastern District of Texas and against Hisense in the Northern District of
15 Georgia, and against both parties in the ITC, alleging infringement of the '168 Patent
16 and the '751 Patent against both parties, in each jurisdiction based on the similar
17 targeting of Dolby Vision.

18 52. Through its TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX Complaint, and
19 Hisense NDGA Complaint, InterDigital seeks to target Dolby by asserting
20 infringement theories for the '168 Patent centered on Dolby Vision. InterDigital
21 attached a claim chart to the TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX Complaint,
22 and the Hisense NDGA Complaint for the '168 Patent that squarely and expressly
23 targets Dolby Vision, accusing TCL and Hisense of infringing the '168 Patent by
24 virtue of TCL's and Hisense's incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the "Accused
25 Products" (i.e., "Products that support high dynamic range ('HDR') formats including
26 HDR10, HDR10+, and/or Dolby Vision") and/or "HDR Accused Instrumentalities"
27 (i.e., "all Hisense devices capable of playing back HDR10, HDR10+, or Dolby Vision
28 content"). See Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶¶ 8, 28, 112-14; **Exhibit 15** (Hisense

1 NDGA Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart); TCL EDTX
2 Complaint, ¶¶ 6, 35, 115-17; **Exhibit 16** (TCL EDTX Complaint '168 Patent
3 purported infringement claim chart); **Exhibit 18** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint '168
4 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to TCL); **Exhibit 17** (TCL/Hisense ITC
5 Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to Hisense).

6 53. InterDigital's '168 claim charts attached to the TCL/Hisense ITC
7 Complaint and its TCL EDTX and Hisense NDGA Complaints confirm that
8 InterDigital's infringement allegations are directed at Dolby Vision. InterDigital's
9 TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX and Hisense NDGA Complaints each
10 attach a claim chart for the '168 Patent that squarely and expressly targets Dolby
11 Vision, accusing TCL and Hisense of infringing the '168 Patent by virtue of TCL's
12 and Hisense's incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the "HDR Accused
13 Instrumentalities," and expressly and repeatedly citing Dolby documentation and
14 materials drawn from Dolby's website. *See, e.g., Exhibit 15* at 5 (Hisense NDGA
15 Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart) (citing Dolby Vision
16 White Paper showing Dolby Vision workflow); *id.* at 7 (highlighting "Viewing of the
17 HDMI stream" with "Dolby Vision"); **Exhibit 16** (TCL EDTX Complaint '168 Patent
18 purported infringement claim chart, citing Dolby Vision White Paper showing Dolby
19 Vision workflow); *id.* at 6 (highlighting "Viewing of the HDMI stream" with "Dolby
20 Vision"); **Exhibits 17-18** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint '168 Patent purported
21 infringement claim charts, showing same).

22 54. Through its TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX Complaint, and
23 Hisense NDGA Complaint, InterDigital seeks to target Dolby by asserting
24 infringement theories for the '751 Patent centered on Dolby Vision. InterDigital
25 attached a claim chart to each of the TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX and
26 the Hisense NDGA Complaints for the '751 Patent that squarely and expressly targets
27 Dolby Vision, accusing TCL and Hisense of infringing the '751 Patent by virtue of
28 TCL's and Hisense's incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the "Accused

1 Products” (i.e., “Products that support high dynamic range (‘HDR’) formats including
2 HDR10, HDR10+, and/or Dolby Vision”) and/or “HDR Accused Instrumentalities”
3 (i.e., “all Hisense devices capable of playing back HDR10, HDR10+, or Dolby Vision
4 content”). See Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶¶ 8, 28, 121-23; **Exhibit 7** (Hisense
5 NDGA Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart); TCL EDTX
6 Complaint, ¶¶ 6, 35, 124-126; **Exhibit 8** (TCL EDTX Complaint ’751 Patent
7 purported infringement claim chart); **Exhibit 10** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint ’751
8 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to TCL); **Exhibit 9** (TCL/Hisense ITC
9 Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to Hisense).

10 55. InterDigital’s ’751 claim charts attached to the TCL/Hisense ITC
11 Complaint, the TCL EDTX and Hisense NDGA Complaints confirm that
12 InterDigital’s infringement allegations are directed at Dolby Vision. InterDigital’s
13 TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL EDTX and Hisense NDGA Complaints each
14 attach a claim chart for the ’751 Patent that squarely and expressly targets Dolby
15 Vision, accusing TCL and Hisense of infringing the ’751 Patent by virtue of TCL’s
16 and Hisense’s incorporation and use of Dolby Vision in the “HDR Accused
17 Instrumentalities,” and expressly and repeatedly citing Dolby documentation and
18 materials drawn from Dolby’s website. See, e.g., **Exhibit 7** (Hisense NDGA
19 Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart, relying on Dolby Vision
20 sources and Dolby Vision workflow throughout infringement chart); **Exhibit 8** at 4-
21 7 (TCL EDTX Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart, relying on
22 Dolby Vision sources and Dolby Vision workflow throughout infringement chart);
23 **Exhibits 9-10** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement
24 claim charts, showing same).

25 56. InterDigital does not allege in its TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint, TCL
26 EDTX Complaint, its Hisense NDGA Complaint, or the attached ’168 and ’751 claim
27 charts that either TCL or Hisense uses Dolby Vision or incorporates Dolby Vision
28

1 into the HDR Accused Instrumentalities in any manner outside Dolby's specifications
2 or licensing instructions.

3 * * *

4 57. Neither Dolby, Dolby Vision, nor its customers using Dolby Vision
5 infringe or have infringed, either directly or indirectly, any claim of any of the Patents-
6 in-Suit. In view of InterDigital's allegations that Dolby Vision (or its use) infringes
7 or will infringe the Patents-in-Suit, a substantial controversy exists between the
8 parties which is of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant declaratory relief.

9 **THE PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

10 58. On April 3, 2012, the United States Patent and Trademark Office
11 ("USPTO") issued the '338 Patent, titled "Method and Apparatus for Color Decision
12 Metadata Generation" to named inventors Eric Carl Rehm, Joshua Pines, Pierre
13 Ollivier, Jan Van Rooy, and David J. Bancroft. On information and belief, and
14 assuming maintenance fees have been paid, the '338 Patent has not expired. A true
15 and correct copy of the '338 Patent is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

16 59. On May 16, 2017, the USPTO issued the '751 Patent, titled "Method,
17 Apparatus and System for Providing Color Grading for Displays" to named inventors
18 Ingo Tobias Doser, Xueming Henry Gu, Pierre Jean Ollivier, Michael Allan Sterling,
19 Bongsun Lee, Rainer Zwing, Carlos Correa, and Jurgen Stauder. On information and
20 belief, and assuming maintenance fees have been paid, the '751 Patent has not
21 expired. A true and correct copy of the '751 Patent is attached as **Exhibit 2**.

22 60. On August 29, 2017, the USPTO issued the '674 Patent, titled "Method
23 and Device for Converting an Image Sequence Whose Luminance Values Belong to
24 a High Dynamic Range" to named inventors Ronan Boitard, Dominique Thoreau, and
25 Yannick Olivier. On information and belief, and assuming maintenance fees have
26 been paid, the '674 Patent has not expired. A true and correct copy of the '674 Patent
27 is attached as **Exhibit 3**.

61. On August 11, 2020, the USPTO issued the '211 Patent, titled “Information Processing Device, Information Recording Medium, and Information Processing Method” to named inventors Ryohei Takahashi and Kouichi Uchimura. On information and belief, and assuming maintenance fees have been paid, the '211 Patent has not expired. A true and correct copy of the '211 Patent is attached as **Exhibit 4.**

62. On July 26, 2022, the USPTO issued the '168 Patent, titled "Method for Encoding and Method for Decoding a Color Transform and Corresponding Devices" to named inventors Pierre Andrivon, Philippe Bordes, and Emmanuel Jolly. On information and belief, and assuming maintenance fees have been paid, the '168 Patent has not expired. A true and correct copy of the '168 Patent is attached as **Exhibit 5.**

COUNT I

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '338 Patent)

63. Dolby incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs and allegations as if fully set forth herein.

64. In the Amazon EDVA Complaint, InterDigital alleged that “Amazon has infringed and continues to infringe the ’338 Patent, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States or importing into the United States infringing products and/or services, including at least the HDR Accused Instrumentalities, and/or inducing others to do the same” where the “HDR Accused Instrumentalities” includes “all Amazon devices capable of playing back HDR10, HDR10+, or Dolby Vision content.” *See* Amazon EDVA Complaint, ¶¶ 84-86, n.6; **Exhibit 6** (Amazon EDVA Complaint ’338 Patent purported infringement claim chart).

65. Contrary to InterDigital's allegations, neither Dolby Vision nor its use infringes (or has infringed) any claims of the '338 Patent.

66. In the EDVA Complaint, InterDigital identifies only claim 7 of the '338 Patent as being allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision. Claim 7 is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
7[Preamble]	A method of performing a color correction operation comprising the steps of:
7[a]	determining with a processor of a color correction machine a number of color correction operations to be performed in response to received metadata; and
7[b]	performing with the processor of said color correction machine the color correction operations determined in said previous step on image data and said color correction operations are performed on a specified region of an image selected from image data used for rendering a sequence of images.

67. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitation 7[a] of the '338 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed step of determining with a processor of a color correction machine a number of color correction operations to be performed in response to received metadata.

68. Dependent claim 8, which depends from claim 7, is not infringed for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 67.

69. To the extent InterDigital would assert the claims that are not currently asserted in the EDVA Complaint (i.e., claims 1-6), Dolby Vision also does not infringe these non-asserted claims.

70. Based on the foregoing, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Dolby and InterDigital regarding the alleged infringement of the '338 Patent by Dolby Vision or its use that warrants issuance of a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* and Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 that neither Dolby nor its customers by virtue of using Dolby Vision have infringed the '338 Patent.

71. Dolby seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that Dolby and Dolby Vision—including use of Dolby Vision—does not infringe under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) any claim of the '338 Patent. Such a determination and declaration are necessary and appropriate at this time to resolve the parties' dispute regarding alleged infringement of the '338 Patent.

COUNT II

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '751 Patent)

72. Dolby incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs and allegations as if fully set forth herein.

73. In the TCL EDTX Complaint, InterDigital alleged that “TCL has infringed and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States or importing into the United States infringing products and/or services, including at least the HDR Accused Instrumentalities, and/or inducing others to do the same” and that “TCL infringes at least claim 14 [of the ’751 Patent] by enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities” through the use of Dolby Vision. *See* TCL EDTX Complaint at ¶¶ 124-29; **Exhibit 8** (TCL EDTX Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart); **Exhibit 10** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint ’751 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to TCL).

74. In the Hisense NDGA Complaint, InterDigital alleged that “Hisense has infringed and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in the United States or importing into the United States infringing products and/or services, including at least the HDR Accused Instrumentalities, and/or inducing others to do the same” and that “Hisense infringes at least claim 14 [of the ’751 Patent] by enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities” through the use of Dolby Vision. Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶¶ 121-26; **Exhibit 7** (Hisense NDGA

Complaint '751 Patent purported infringement claim chart); **Exhibit 9** (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint '751 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to Hisense).

75. Contrary to InterDigital's allegations, neither Dolby Vision nor its use infringes (or has infringed) any claims of the '751 Patent.

76. In the NDGA and EDTX Complaints, InterDigital identifies only claim 14 of the '751 Patent as being allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision. Claim 14 is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
14[Preamble]	A display unit for processing a plurality of picture data, comprising:
14[a]	a display including a display specification including at least one display requirement;
14[b]	a picture selector for obtaining the plurality of picture data and operative to access a plurality of different virtual device models, each of the virtual device models including at least one parameter for specifying at least one display feature, and wherein the picture selector is configured to select one of the virtual device models to control a display picture provided by the display based on a comparison between the virtual device models and the display specification of the display, and the picture selector is further configured to select one of the plurality of the picture data based on the selected one of the virtual device models; and
14[c]	a picture calibration component configured to adapt the selected one of the plurality of picture data selected by the picture selector to be displayed on the same display based on the selected virtual device model.

1 77. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitations 14[b] or
2 14[c] of the '751 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed picture
3 selector for obtaining the plurality of picture data and operative to access a plurality
4 of different virtual device models. In addition, neither Dolby Vision nor its use
5 involves the claimed picture selector that is configured to select one of the virtual
6 device models to control a display picture provided by the display based on a
7 comparison between the virtual device models and the display specification of the
8 display. And neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed picture selector
9 that is further configured to select one of the plurality of the picture data based on the
10 selected one of the virtual device model; and a picture calibration component
11 configured to adapt the selected one of the plurality of picture data selected by the
12 picture selector to be displayed on the same display based on the selected virtual
13 device model.

14 78. Dependent claims 15-18, which depend from claim 14, are not infringed
15 for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 77.

16 79. To the extent InterDigital would assert the claims that are not currently
17 asserted in the ITC Complaint, the NDGA Complaint or the EDTX Complaint (i.e.,
18 claims 1-13), Dolby Vision also does not infringe these non-asserted claims.

19 80. Based on the foregoing, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists
20 between Dolby and InterDigital regarding the alleged infringement of the '751 Patent
21 by Dolby Vision or its use that warrants issuance of a declaratory judgment pursuant
22 to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* and Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 that neither Dolby nor its customers
23 by virtue of using Dolby Vision have infringed the '751 Patent.

24 81. Dolby seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that Dolby and
25 Dolby Vision—including use of Dolby Vision—does not infringe under 35 U.S.C.
26 § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) any claim of the '751 Patent. Such a determination
27 and declaration are necessary and appropriate at this time to resolve the parties'
28 dispute regarding alleged infringement of the '751 Patent.

COUNT III

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '674 Patent)

82. Dolby incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs and allegations as if fully set forth herein.

83. In the Amazon DE Complaint and Amazon ITC Complaint, InterDigital alleged that “Amazon infringes at least Claims 1 and 10 of the '674 Patent by enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities” where the “HDR Accused Instrumentalities includes all Amazon devices capable of playing back . . . Dolby Vision content.” *See* Amazon DE Complaint at ¶¶ 79-80, n.4; **Exhibit 11** (Amazon DE Complaint '674 Patent purported infringement claim chart).

84. Contrary to InterDigital’s allegations, neither Dolby Vision nor its use infringes (or has infringed) any claims of the '674 Patent.

85. Claim 1 of the '674 Patent, which is identified by InterDigital in the Amazon DE Complaint and the Amazon ITC Complaint as allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision, is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
1[Preamble]	A method for converting an original image sequence whose luminance values belong to a given dynamic range, said method comprising:
1[a]	converting, image-by-image, the dynamic range of the luminance component of each image of the original image sequence by applying a dynamic range conversion operator to the luminance component of each image of the original image sequence to obtain a modified luminance component whose values belong to a lower dynamic range than that of the original image sequence, wherein it also comprises:

Limitation	Claim Language
1[b]	correcting the dynamic range of the values of the luminance component thus modified by reducing it by a value calculated from a global characteristic of the original image sequence.

86. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitation 1[b] of the '674 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed step of correcting the dynamic range of the values of the luminance component thus modified by reducing it by a value calculated from a global characteristic of the original image sequence.

87. Claim 10 of the '674 Patent, which is identified by InterDigital in the Amazon DE Complaint and the Amazon ITC Complaint as allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision, is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
10[Preamble]	A device for converting an original image sequence whose luminance values belong to a given dynamic range, said device comprising a processor configured to:
10[a]	convert, image-by-image, the dynamic range of the luminance component of each image of the original image sequence by applying a dynamic range conversion operator to the luminance component of each image of the original image sequence to obtain a modified luminance component whose values belong to a lower dynamic range than that of the original image sequence, wherein the processor is further configured to:
10[b]	correct the dynamic range of the values of the luminance component thus modified by reducing it by a value calculated from a global characteristic of the original image sequence.

88. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitation 10[b] of the '674 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed processor configured to correct the dynamic range of the values of the luminance component thus modified by reducing it by a value calculated from a global characteristic of the original image sequence.

89. Dependent claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are not infringed for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 86.

90. Dependent claims 11-18, which depend from claim 10, are not infringed for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 88.

91. Based on the foregoing, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Dolby and InterDigital regarding the alleged infringement of the '674 Patent by Dolby Vision or its use that warrants issuance of a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* and Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 that neither Dolby nor its customers by virtue of using Dolby Vision have infringed the '674 Patent.

92. Dolby seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that Dolby and Dolby Vision—including use of Dolby Vision—does not infringe under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) any claim of the '674 Patent. Such a determination and declaration are necessary and appropriate at this time to resolve the parties' dispute regarding alleged infringement of the '674 Patent.

COUNT IV

(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '211 Patent)

93. Dolby incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs and allegations as if fully set forth herein.

94. In the Amazon DE Complaint and Amazon ITC Complaint, InterDigital alleged that “Amazon infringes at least Claims 1 and 12 of the ’211 Patent by enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities,” where the “HDR Accused Instrumentalities includes all Amazon devices capable of playing back . . . Dolby

Vision content.” *See* Amazon DE Complaint at ¶¶ 70-72, n.4; **Exhibit 13** (Amazon DE Complaint ’211 Patent purported infringement claim chart).

95. Contrary to InterDigital’s allegations, neither Dolby Vision nor its use infringes (or has infringed) any claims of the ’211 Patent.

96. Claim 1 of the ’211 Patent, which is identified by InterDigital in the Amazon DE Complaint and the Amazon ITC Complaint as allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision, is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
1[Preamble]	An information processing device, comprising:
1[a]	a data processing unit configured to:
1[b]	acquire high dynamic range (HDR) image metadata from an MP4 file, wherein
1[c]	the acquired HDR image metadata includes a maximum value of frame average luminance of HDR image data stored in the MP4 file, and
1[d]	the HDR image data stored in the MP4 file is based on an MP4 format;
1[e]	acquire display function information of a display unit from the display unit;
1[f]	read the HDR image data from the MP4 file;
1[g]	execute a conversion process of the read HDR image data based on the acquired HDR image metadata and the acquired display function information of the display unit;
1[h]	execute an output image generation process based on the execution of the conversion process; and
1[i]	output an image signal to the display unit based on the executed output image generation process.

97. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitations 1[c] or 1[g] of the '211 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed acquired HDR image metadata including a maximum value of frame average luminance of HDR image data stored in the MP4 file and the claimed data processing unit configured to execute a conversion process of the read HDR image data based on the acquired HDR image metadata and the acquired display function information of the display unit.

98. Claim 12 of the '211 Patent, which is identified by InterDigital in the Amazon DE Complaint and the Amazon ITC Complaint as allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision, is reproduced below:

Limitation	Claim Language
12[Preamble]	An information processing method comprising:
12[a]	in an information processing device:
12[b]	acquiring, by a data processing unit of the information processing device, high dynamic range (HDR) image metadata from an MP4 file, wherein
12[c]	the acquired HDR image metadata includes a maximum value of frame average luminance of HDR image data stored in the MP4 file, and
12[d]	the HDR image data stored in the MP4 file is based on an MP4 format;
12[e]	acquiring, by the data processing unit, display function information of a display unit from the display unit;
12[f]	reading, by the data processing unit, the HDR image data from the MP4 file;
12[g]	executing, by the data processing unit, a conversion process of the read HDR image data based on the acquired HDR image metadata and the acquired display function information of the display unit;

Limitation	Claim Language
12[h]	executing, by the data processing unit, an output image generation process based on the execution of the conversion process; and
12[i]	outputting, by the data processing unit, an image signal to the display unit based on the executed output image generation process.

99. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitations 12[c] or 12[g] of the '211 Patent. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed acquired HDR image metadata including a maximum value of frame average luminance of HDR image data stored in the MP4 file and the claimed step of executing, by the data processing unit, a conversion process of the read HDR image data based on the acquired HDR image metadata and the acquired display function information of the display unit.

100. Dependent claims 2-4, which depend from claim 1, are not infringed for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 97.

101. To the extent InterDigital would assert the claims that are not currently asserted in the Amazon DE Complaint or the Amazon ITC Complaint (i.e., claims 5-11 and 13-15), Dolby Vision also does not infringe these non-asserted claims.

102. Based on the foregoing, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Dolby and InterDigital regarding the alleged infringement of the '211 Patent by Dolby Vision or its use that warrants issuance of a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* and Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 that neither Dolby nor its customers by virtue of using Dolby Vision have infringed the '211 Patent.

103. Dolby seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that Dolby and Dolby Vision—including use of Dolby Vision—does not infringe under 35 U.S.C. § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) any claim of the '211 Patent. Such a determination

1 and declaration are necessary and appropriate at this time to resolve the parties'
2 dispute regarding alleged infringement of the '211 Patent.

3 **COUNT V**

4 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '168 Patent)**

5 104. Dolby incorporates by reference the foregoing paragraphs and
6 allegations as if fully set forth herein.

7 105. In the TCL EDTX Complaint, InterDigital alleged that "TCL has
8 infringed and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents,
9 in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in
10 the United States or importing into the United States infringing products and/or
11 services, including at least the HDR Accused Instrumentalities, and/or inducing others
12 to do the same" and that "TCL infringes at least claim 18 [of the '168 Patent] by
13 enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities" through the use of
14 Dolby Vision. *See* TCL EDTX Complaint at ¶¶ 115-20; **Exhibit 16** (TCL EDTX
15 Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart); *see also* **Exhibit 18**
16 (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to
17 TCL).

18 106. In the Hisense NDGA Complaint, InterDigital alleged that "Hisense has
19 infringed and continues to infringe, literally and/or under the doctrine of equivalents,
20 in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in
21 the United States or importing into the United States infringing products and/or
22 services, including at least the HDR Accused Instrumentalities, and/or inducing others
23 to do the same" and that "Hisense infringes at least claim 18 [of the '168 Patent] by
24 enabling HDR playback on the HDR Accused Instrumentalities" through the use of
25 Dolby Vision. Hisense NDGA Complaint, ¶¶ 112-17; **Exhibit 15** (Hisense NDGA
26 Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart); *see also* **Exhibit 17**
27 (TCL/Hisense ITC Complaint '168 Patent purported infringement claim chart as to
28 Hisense).

1 107. Contrary to InterDigital's allegations, neither Dolby Vision nor its use
2 infringes (or has infringed) any claims of the '168 Patent.

3 108. In the ITC, NDGA, and EDTX Complaints, InterDigital identifies only
4 claim 18 of the '168 Patent as being allegedly infringed by Dolby Vision. Claim 18
5 is reproduced below:

6 Limitation	Claim Language
7 18[Preamble]	An apparatus comprising at least one processor and at least one 8 memory having stored instructions operative, when executed by 9 the at least one processor, to cause the apparatus to:
10 18[a]	decode target parameters describing characteristics for a target 11 color space for a video picture to be displayed in the target color 12 space;
13 18[b]	decode color transform parameters that facilitate remapping the 14 video picture from a first color space to the target color space;
15 18[c]	remap the video picture to the target color space utilizing at least 16 one of the decoded color transform parameters; and
17 18[d]	display the remapped video picture in the target color space;
18 18[e]	wherein the color transform parameters represent at least three 19 successively applied color transforms comprising a first color 20 transform followed by a second color transform followed by a 21 third color transform.

22
23 109. Neither Dolby Vision nor its use satisfies at least limitations 18[a], 18[b],
24 or 18[c]; or 18[a], 18[b], 18[c], or 18[d] of the '168 Patent. First, neither Dolby Vision
25 nor its use involves the claimed apparatus to: decode target parameters describing
26 characteristics for a target color space for a video picture to be displayed in the target
27 color space, decode color transform parameters that facilitate remapping the video
28 picture from a first color space to the target color space, and remap the video picture

1 to the target color space utilizing at least one of the decoded color transform
2 parameters. Second, neither Dolby Vision nor its use involves the claimed apparatus
3 to: decode target parameters describing characteristics for a target color space for a
4 video picture to be displayed in the target color space, decode color transform
5 parameters that facilitate remapping the video picture from a first color space to the
6 target color space, remap the video picture to the target color space utilizing at least
7 one of the decoded color transform parameters, and display the remapped video
8 picture in the target color space.

9 110. Dependent claims 19-20, which depend from claim 18, are not infringed
10 for at least the reasons stated above in Paragraph 109.

11 111. To the extent InterDigital would assert the claims that are not currently
12 asserted in the NDGA Complaint or the EDTX Complaint (i.e., claims 1-17 and 21-
13 22), Dolby Vision also does not infringe these non-asserted claims.

14 112. Based on the foregoing, an actual controversy has arisen and now exists
15 between Dolby and InterDigital regarding the alleged infringement of the '168 Patent
16 by Dolby Vision or its use that warrants issuance of a declaratory judgment pursuant
17 to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 *et seq.* and Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 that neither Dolby nor its customers
18 by virtue of using Dolby Vision have infringed the '168 Patent.

19 113. Dolby seeks and is entitled to a declaratory judgment that Dolby and
20 Dolby Vision—including use of Dolby Vision—does not infringe under 35 U.S.C.
21 § 271 (or any sub-section thereof) any claim of the '168 Patent. Such a determination
22 and declaration are necessary and appropriate at this time to resolve the parties'
23 dispute regarding alleged infringement of the '168 Patent.

24 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 WHEREFORE, Dolby respectfully requests:

26 a) that the Court enter a judgment declaring that Dolby, Dolby Vision, and
27 use of Dolby Vision, including by Dolby's customers, has not infringed (directly,
28

1 indirectly, and under the doctrine of equivalents) and does not infringe (directly,
2 indirectly, and under the doctrine of equivalents) the Patents-in-Suit;

3 b) that the Court find this case and InterDigital's actions directed to Dolby
4 and its customers and partners to be exceptional and award Dolby its attorneys' fees
5 under 35 U.S.C. § 285; and

6 c) that the Court award all other and further relief as it deems just and
7 proper.
8

9 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

10 Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs demand
11 trial by jury only to the extent there are any issues triable to a jury and otherwise
12 request a bench trial on the equitable issues raised by the declaratory judgment claims.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: March 3, 2026

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

2 /s/ Christopher S. Marchese

3 Christopher S. Marchese (SBN 170239)
4 marchese@fr.com

5 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
6 4695 MacArthur Court, Suite 1100
7 Newport Beach, CA 92660
8 Tel: (949) 623-7640
9 Fax: (858) 678-5099

10 John W. Thornburgh (SBN 154627)
11 thornburgh@fr.com

12 Madelyn S. McCormick (SBN 320063)
13 mmccormick@fr.com

14 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
15 12860 El Camino Real, Suite 400
16 San Diego, CA 92130
17 Tel: (858) 678-5070 / Fax: (858) 678-
18 5099

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
20 *Dolby Laboratories, Inc.,*
21 *Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corp.,*
22 *and Dolby International AB*
23
24
25
26
27
28