

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X		
WI-LAN INC.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	10 Civ. 432 (LAK) (AJP)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
LG ELECTRONICS, INC. and LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	
-----X		

Defendant LG Electronics, Inc. (“LGE”), by and through its undersigned counsel of record, for its Answer to Plaintiff Wi-LAN, Inc.’s (“Wi-LAN”) First Amended Complaint, states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Wi-LAN’s Amended Complaint is both meritless and misleading. Wi-LAN takes a contract dispute concerning a patent license agreement and converts it into a fraud and patent infringement action for the sole purpose of extorting unjustified royalties from LGE. While Wi-LAN tries to cloak its rhetoric in the legitimacy of the patent laws, there is nothing legitimate about Wi-LAN’s purported claims.

In apparent recognition that its claims are defective, Wi-LAN acts as if it is an enforcement agent of the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”), devoting much of its Amended Complaint to irrelevant allegations concerning an FCC investigation of LGE initiated in August 2007 relating to LGE’s compliance with the FCC’s new DTV V-chip technology requirements. That matter was amicably resolved pursuant to a publicly disclosed Consent Decree entered in April 2008; the Consent Decree has since expired and is wholly unrelated to

Wi-LAN's fraud and patent infringement counts. Wi-LAN's motivation is transparent: it seeks to disguise the weakness of its claims by embarrassing LGE and hoping that the threat of continuing publicity about the FCC matter will spur LGE to pay Wi-LAN royalties that Wi-LAN knows it is not entitled to under the parties' license agreement. Worse yet, it suggests that Wi-LAN will ignore its legal obligations in proving infringement of its patented methods and, instead, merely argue that if LGE complies with the FCC's regulations then it must infringe Wi-LAN's patent.

Interestingly, Wi-LAN's original complaint accused the defendants of breach of contract, fraud, and patent infringement. Apparently realizing the inconsistency of asserting a breach of contract claim, confirming that LGE's accused products are licensed, while simultaneously asserting its patent infringement claim against those same products, Wi-LAN's Amended Complaint no longer includes the breach of contract claim. Conveniently, on April 7, 2010, the day before it filed the Amended Complaint (and almost three months after filing this lawsuit and more than two and a half years after sending a notice of LGE's purported material breach) Wi-LAN sent LGE a letter purporting to terminate the parties' patent license agreement. This letter was neither timely nor effective.

Wi-LAN's patent infringement claim accuses LGE of infringing a single U.S. patent, U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,402 (the "402 patent" or "patent in suit"), which issued in 1996. Wi-LAN's broad allegations of infringement amount to a claim that Wi-LAN invented parental control technology. While Wi-LAN characterizes its invention as the "world famous V-Chip invention," parental control technology was invented more than 10 years before the inventor of the '402 patent even filed his patent application, covering what Wi-LAN characterizes as "flexible" V-chip technology. Wi-LAN's asserted patent claims, however, only cover certain methods for

updating a rating scheme used to facilitate parental control and, importantly, do not include any apparatus or device claims. This nuance is critical in this case because of the distinctions in finding infringement between method and apparatus claims. A method claim is only infringed if each and every step **is actually performed** by the accused method. Thus, a device that is **capable** of performing, but never actually performs, each step of the patented method does not and cannot infringe a method claim. While knowing and appreciating this distinction, Wi-LAN alleges infringement of method claims in its Amended Complaint anyway.

With a not so subtle twist, here, Wi-LAN alleges that for LGE's accused television receivers to comply with the FCC rules governing V-Chip technology requirements for digital television receivers sold in the United States, they must practice the patented method of the '402 patent, which contains solely method and not any apparatus or system claims. Wi-LAN is wrong. Neither LGE's accused television receivers, nor any other U.S. television receivers can infringe Wi-LAN's patented method for flexible V-Chip technology because, even assuming *arguendo* that they were **capable** of receiving a revised ratings table necessary to infringe the patented method, they never **actually receive** nor will they **actually receive** the "second configuration data." The Parental Guidance Rating System that sets the ratings table data that broadcasters transmit in along with their video transmissions in the United States has never changed the ratings table and has agreed not to do so. Thus, even assuming the accuracy of Wi-LAN's assertion that the FCC's rules require that digital television receivers sold in the United States **have the ability** to reconfigure, using remotely transmitted signals (the Parental Guidance Rating Systems used in the V-Chips of the receivers), the United States has never changed the ratings table supplied to television receivers for selectively blocking video programs. Notably, the '402 patent is not directed to the mere ability of a receiver to accept a re-configured ratings

table. Thus, no U.S. television receivers have ever used the patented method covering Wi-LAN's "flexible V-Chip" invention. Nevertheless, Wi-LAN has and continues to try to tax the entire U.S. television receiver market. The defendants provided information to Wi-LAN long ago that confirmed its claims are meritless.

ANSWER

BACKGROUND

1. LGE denies that it has blatantly and willfully disregarded the FCC's regulations and Wi-LAN's rights in the patented V-Chip invention. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

THE PARTIES

2. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

3. Admitted.

4. Admitted.

5. Denied.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. To the extent the allegations of this paragraph purport to state a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required, LGE admits that Wi-LAN's Amended Complaint purports to state causes of action under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* and under New York law, but denies that any such claims by Wi-LAN are meritorious with respect to LGE. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

7. LGE admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338 and 1367, but denies that any of Plaintiff's claims asserted against LGE are meritorious. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

8. To the extent the allegations of this paragraph purport to state a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, LGE further states Plaintiff has not asserted any contract claims and, thus, the forum selection terms of the license agreement are irrelevant. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

9. To the extent the allegations of this paragraph purport to state a legal conclusion, no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, LGE admits that venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b) and 1400(b). LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

10. LGE admits that the '402 patent issued on October 27, 1998 and is entitled "Method and Apparatus for Selectively Blocking Audio and Video Signal." LGE further admits that the '402 patent names Tim Collings as an inventor. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

11. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

12. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

13. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

14. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

15. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

16. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

17. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

18. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

19. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

20. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

LICENSING AGREEMENT WITH LG

21. Admitted.

22. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

23. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

24. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

25. Denied.

26. To the extent the allegations in this paragraph are even understood, LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

27. LGE admits that it provided a signed letter of intent to Wi-LAN on or about February 28, 2006. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

28. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

29. LGE admits that its representatives met with representatives of Tri-Vision on or about March 21, 2006 in Toronto, Canada. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

30. Denied.

31. LGE admits that its representatives met with representatives of Tri-Vision on or about April 25, 2006 in Seoul, Korea. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

32. LGE admits that it executed a license agreement with Tri-Vision, which was effective as of May 17, 2006. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

33. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

34. Denied.

35. LGE admits that, on or about July 2, 2006, LGE accurately and lawfully provided a royalty report indicating no sales of licensed products. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

36. Denied.

37. Denied.

38. LGE admits that LGE entered into a Consent Decree with the FCC on or about April 18, 2008. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

39. Denied.

40. Denied.

41. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

42. Denied.

43. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

44. To the extent this paragraph alleges that LGE has not honored its obligations under the License, such allegations are denied. LGE is without information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining allegations of this paragraph and, accordingly, denies same.

45. Denied.

46. LGE admits that on or about November 26, 2007, Wi-LAN notified LGE of its purported material breach of the License but denies that it was ever in breach of the License or that it failed to cure any alleged breach. LGE further admits that in a letter dated April 7, 2010, the day before this Amended Complaint was filed, Wi-LAN purported to terminate the License but denies the License was lawfully terminated. LGE denies the remaining allegations of this paragraph.

COUNT 1 -- FRAUDULENT INDUCEMENT

47. LGE incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-46 as if fully set forth herein.

48. Denied.

49. Denied.

50. Denied.

51. Denied.

52. Denied.

53. Denied.

COUNT 2 -- PATENT INFRINGEMENT

54. LGE incorporates by reference its responses to paragraphs 1-53 as if fully set forth herein.

55. Denied.

56. Denied.

57. Denied.

58. Denied.

59. Denied.

RELIEF REQUESTED

LGE denies that Wi-LAN is entitled to judgment in its favor, or to any other relief whatsoever.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Non-Infringement)

1. LGE does not infringe, directly or indirectly, literally or pursuant to the doctrine of equivalents, any claim of the patent in suit.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(License)

2. LGE does not and cannot infringe the patent in suit, because it has, at all times relevant herein, been licensed under the patent in suit and continues to be licensed under the patent in suit.

3. Further evidencing that LGE was and remains licensed under the '402 patent at all relevant times, and notwithstanding Wi-LAN's purported termination letter on April 7, 2010, Wi-LAN's website continues to advertise LGE as a licensee under its patented V-Chip technology. See "WiLAN - Licensing - V-Chip," <http://67.192.1.247/Licensing/V-Chip/default.aspx>, May 5, 2010, Exhibit 1.

4. Alternatively, LGE is not liable to Wi-LAN for damages for patent infringement that may have occurred prior to April 7, 2010, the date Wi-LAN purported to terminate its license to LGE of the patent in suit.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Invalidity)

5. The claims of the patent in suit are invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, and/or 112.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Lack of Notice)

6. Plaintiff's requested relief is barred or otherwise limited by 35 U.S.C. § 287, in that Plaintiff and/or one or more of its licensees failed to properly mark all articles purportedly covered by one or more claims of the patent in suit with the relevant patent number. Additionally, Plaintiff cannot recover damages from LGE, if any are awarded, with respect to the patent in suit, prior to the date on which LGE received notice of Plaintiff's infringement contentions regarding the patent in suit on January 19, 2010.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Equitable Relief Unavailable)

7. Plaintiff is not entitled to injunctive relief, whether preliminary or permanent, because:

- (a) Plaintiff cannot show it is likely to succeed on the merits;

- (b) Plaintiff is a non-practicing, patent licensing entity that is obligated to license the '402 on fair and non-discriminatory grounds pursuant to the policies of certain standards setting organizations to which it submitted the '402 patent, and cannot show irreparable harm if injunctive relief is not granted;
- (c) the balance of hardships between Plaintiff and LGE does not warrant injunctive relief; and
- (d) the public interest would not be served by granting injunctive relief against LGE.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Laches)

8. Wi-LAN's claims are barred, at least in part, with respect to Wi-LAN's claims for pre-suit damages due to laches because Wi-LAN's unreasonably delayed in filing this action, and unreasonably delayed in prosecuting the asserted claims, after LGE had invested, and continues to invest, time and money into building its business and goodwill.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Innocent Intent)

9. LGE has engaged in all relevant activities in good faith, thereby precluding Wi-LAN, even if it prevails, from recovering its reasonable attorneys' fees and/or costs under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Prosecution History Estoppel)

10. By reason of proceedings in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") during the prosecution of the applications that ultimately led to the issuance of the patent in suit, Wi-LAN is estopped from asserting that any claim of the patent in suit is

infringed by LGE under the doctrine of equivalents.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Unenforceability Due to Inequitable Conduct Before the USPTO)

11. On information and belief, the named inventor of the patent in suit, Timothy Collings (“Collings”) had knowledge of highly material prior art that was known and available to the public more than one year prior to the earliest claimed priority date of the patent in suit.

12. Specifically Collings published without restriction an article he had written entitled “Violence and Television: The Canadian Example” (the “Collings Article”) at the International Symposium, Canadian Studies Centre, Sorbonne Nouvelle University, Paris, France, held June 16-18, 1994.

13. The Collings Article anticipates or, taken individually or in combination with other references, renders obvious one or more claims of the patent in suit and was material to the patentability of the pending claims in the applications leading to the patent in suit.

14. In particular, the Collings Article discloses, among other things, blocking the display of the video if the result of the comparison between the extracted information and the stored preference information indicates that the video should not be displayed, and allowing the video to be displayed if the result of the comparison indicates that the video should be displayed.

15. The Collings Article is both material to the patentability of the patent in suit and non-cumulative of the prior cited by the Examiner during the prosecution of the applications leading to the patent in suit, as evidenced by the USPTO’s recent Order Granting Request for Ex Parte Reexamination, dated March 2, 2010, and finding a Substantial New Question of Patentability affecting Claims 7-15 of the patent in suit, in view

of the Collings Article, together with General Instrument's "System Information Description" and U.S. Patent No. 4,685,131. The Collings Article published more than one year before the patent in suit's priority date of June 19, 1996.

16. While Collings and others associated with the filing and prosecution of the applications resulting in issuance of the patent in suit were well aware of the substance and materiality of the Collings Article, the alleged inventors, their counsel, their assignees, their agent(s), representative(s), and/or other associated person(s) involved in the preparation or prosecution of the patent in suit knowingly withheld the existence of the Collings Article from the patent examiner with the intent to deceive the PTO. Accordingly, the alleged inventors, their counsel, and/or their assignees breached their duties of candor, good faith, and honesty to the PTO in violation of 37 C.F.R § 1.56.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
(Failure to State a Claim)

17. Wi-LAN failed to state a claim for which relief may be provided.

18. Wi-LAN failed to state a claim for fraud because it has not plead its fraud claim with the particularity required by Rule 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

19. Wi-LAN failed to state a claim for patent infringement because it admits that LGE is licensed under the patent in suit and, even assuming *arguendo* that the License Agreement was terminated by notice sent on April 7, 2010, there was no basis for asserting patent infringement on the date this lawsuit was filed.

COUNTERCLAIMS

Counterclaim-Plaintiff LGE alleges as follows on information and belief for its Counterclaims against Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Wi-LAN.

NATURE OF THE LAWSUIT

20. These Counterclaims are for declarations of patent non-infringement and patent invalidity and unenforceability arising under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 et seq., and the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq. In addition, LGE seeks a declaration that the License Agreement is valid, enforceable and not terminated. Finally, LGE asserts a counterclaim for breach of contract associated with Wi-LAN's unlawful and unjustified attempt to terminate the License Agreement.

THE PARTIES

21. Counterclaim-Plaintiff LGE is a Korean company with its principal place of business at LG Twin Towers, 20, Yeouido-dong, Yeongdeungpo-gu, Seoul 150-721, Korea. LGE is a world leader in the field of electronics and consumer appliances, including television receivers.

22. On information and belief, Counterclaim-Defendant Wi-LAN is a Canadian company with its principal place of business at 11 Holland Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1Y 4S1.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

23. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over these counterclaims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1367, 1338, and 2201-02.

24. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1367, 1391(b), and 1400(b).

25. By virtue of the Complaint filed by Wi-LAN in this action, there is an actual and justiciable controversy between LGE and Wi-LAN, concerning non-infringement, invalidity and unenforceability with respect to the '402 patent. In addition, there is an actual

and justiciable controversy between LGE and Wi-LAN, concerning the existence, status and enforceability of a license agreement between the parties under the '402 patent. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate to resolve this controversy.

COUNT I
Declaratory Judgment of Noninfringement

26. LGE realleges and incorporates herein the foregoing responses, affirmative defenses and allegations.

27. LGE has not in the past, and does not now make, use, sell, offer to sell, or import any products that infringe any valid claim of the '402 Patent, either directly or indirectly, and LGE does not and has not infringed, contributed to the infringement of, or induced infringement of any valid claim of the '402 Patent either directly or under the doctrine of equivalents.

28. This case qualifies as an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT II
Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity

29. LGE realleges and incorporates herein the foregoing responses, affirmative defenses and allegations.

30. One or more claims of the '402 Patent are invalid for failing to comply with one or more requirements for patentability set forth in 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.*

31. This case qualifies as an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT III
Declaratory Judgment of Unenforceability

32. LGE realleges and incorporates herein the foregoing responses, affirmative defenses and allegations, including but not limited to the facts asserted in support of the

Ninth Affirmative Defense.

33. The '402 Patent is unenforceable because Wi-LAN failed to comply with its duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the USPTO.

34. The details surrounding Wi-LAN's inequitable conduct are explained in paragraphs 10-15 above, which are incorporated by reference herein.

35. This case qualifies as an exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT IV

Declaration that the License Agreement is Effective and Not Terminated

36. LGE realleges and incorporates herein the foregoing responses, affirmative defenses and allegations.

37. On May 26, 2006, Wi-LAN's predecessor, Tri-Vision Electronics Inc. ("Tri-Vision"), and LGE entered into a License Agreement in which Tri-Vision granted to LGE a license under the patent in suit to make, have made, import, export, use and sell television receivers which are, or the use of which is, within the scope of the patent in suit.

38. On November 26, 2007, Wi-LAN, through its counsel, sent a letter to LGE notifying LGE that it was in material breach of the License Agreement.

39. LGE exchanged numerous correspondence with Wi-LAN during the first half of 2008 explaining that LGE had not breached the License Agreement.

40. LGE has duly performed all terms and conditions of the License Agreement required of LGE.

41. Wi-LAN admits that it is required by law to license the '402 patent to LGE, and others, on fair and non-discriminatory terms.

42. Nevertheless, more than two and a half years after notifying LGE of its purported breach, nearly three months after filing this lawsuit and the day before it filed its

Amended Complaint, Wi-LAN sent LGE a letter dated April 7, 2010, purporting to terminate the License Agreement.

43. Notwithstanding its April 7, 2010 letter, Wi-LAN's website continues to advertise LGE as a licensee under its patented V-Chip technology. *See* "WiLAN – Licensing – V-Chip," <http://67.192.1.247/Licensing/V-Chip/default.aspx>, May 5, 2010, Exhibit 1. If LGE is not licensed under the '402 patent then Wi-LAN's use of LGE's trademarked name and logo on its website in advertising its V-Chip technology licensing services would constitute trademark infringement and unfair competition.

44. The License Agreement is valid, enforceable and continues to bind the parties thereto, Wi-LAN's termination was unjustified and invalid, and the License Agreement was not terminated but, instead, remains in full force and effect.

COUNT V
Breach of Contract

45. LGE realleges and incorporates herein the foregoing responses, affirmative defenses and allegations.

46. The License Agreement is valid, enforceable and binding on the parties thereto, and Wi-LAN's termination was unjustified.

47. LGE has duly performed all terms and conditions of the License Agreement required of LGE.

48. Wi-LAN's unjustified and unlawful attempt to terminate the License Agreement constitutes a breach of the License Agreement.

49. Wi-LAN's breach has caused LGE damages, including but not limited to the expenses associated with this lawsuit.

LGE'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, LGE respectfully prays that the Court grant the following relief:

A. Entry of judgment in LGE's favor on each and every count of Wi-LAN's First Amended Complaint and LGE's Counterclaims;

B. Entry of an order directing that LGE is not liable to Wi-LAN for any damages pursuant to Wi-LAN's Amended Complaint;

C. Entry of a judicial declaration that LGE has not infringed and is not infringing, directly or indirectly, literally or pursuant to the doctrine of equivalents, or otherwise any claim of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402;

D. Entry of a judicial declaration that the claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402 are invalid;

E. Entry of a judicial declaration that the claims of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402 are unenforceable;

F. Entry of a judicial declaration that the May 17, 2006 License Agreement remains in force and effect;

G. Award money damages including compensatory damages, treble damages, punitive damages, and attorneys' fees and costs;

H. Entry of an order that LGE is a prevailing party and that this is an exceptional case, and awarding LGE its costs, disbursements, and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285, and any other applicable statutes, rules, or common law; and

J. Such other and further relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

JURY DEMAND

LGE requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: New York, New York
May 7, 2010

GREENBERG TRAUIG, LLP

/s/ Richard A. Edlin

Richard A. Edlin (RE 1998)
Daniel I.A. Smulian (DS 4746)
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166
(212) 801-6528 (*telephone*)
(212) 801-5528 (*facsimile*)
edlinr@gtlaw.com

Of counsel:

Richard D. Harris (*pro hac vice*)
Jeffrey G. Mote (*pro hac vice*)
Eric J. Maiers (*pro hac vice*)
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 456-8400 (*telephone*)
harrisr@gtlaw.com
motej@gtlaw.com
maierse@gtlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants LG Electronics,
Inc. and LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on May 7, 2010, the foregoing **Answer to Plaintiff Wi-LAN, Inc.'s First Amended Complaint** was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel that have appeared for any party in this matter.

/s/ Richard A. Edlin
Richard A. Edlin

EXHIBIT 1

HOME > LICENSING > V-CHIP

V-CHIP TECHNOLOGIES**Introduction**

In 1991 Professor Tim Collings developed a technology that allows users of digital television receivers to filter out programming that they consider inappropriate. This technology came to be known as V-Chip. A Canadian company, Tri-Vision International, entered into a partnership with Professor Collings to further develop and commercialize this technology. V-Chip technology was legislated by former U.S. President Bill Clinton in 1996 and has been available in the U.S. and Canada since 1999. A partnership between Tri-Vision International and Samsung Electronics developed the first V-Chip-enabled TV, which was launched at the Consumer Electronics Show in 1999.

Also in 1999, Tri-Vision began licensing V-Chip technology to TV manufacturers. Wi-LAN Inc. acquired Tri-Vision International in 2007 to bring additional resources and expertise to licensing the valuable V-Chip technology. At present, millions of V-Chip-enabled TVs and DTV receivers sold each year are licensed to WiLAN's V-Chip technology.

In the United States, the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) has mandated that V-Chip be included in all digital TV sets with picture screens 13" or larger, as well as digital television receivers (DVD Players, PVRs) that are sold without an associated display.

Many organizations have spoken about the valuable role that WiLAN's V-Chip technology plays in protecting children from inappropriate content that pervades television today.

"In the scientific literature on media violence, the connection of media violence to real-life aggressive behavior and violence has been substantiated...television ratings system and the V-Chip are tools that can help protect children from potentially harmful content"

American Academy of Pediatrics

"Research over many decades has shown that watching violent TV is a problem, because it makes some kids under some conditions more likely to behave aggressively...One solution that the government offered was V-Chip"

Annenberg Public Policy Center at the University of Pennsylvania

"CEA again is taking a leadership role, working in partnership with the content, cable and broadcast industries in a voluntary agreement to educate parents about the V-Chip. CEA believes that it is our obligation as an industry to ensure that parents are aware of the tools they have to protect their children from offensive content."

Consumer Electronics Association

Portfolio

WiLAN's portfolio of patented inventions, including V-Chip, that apply to consumer electronics devices consists of over 185 issued and pending patents that cover the United States, various countries in Europe and Asia as well as Canada.

Licensees

Our patented V-Chip technology has been licensed by over 110 companies including:



Trademarks are property of their respective owners.

To find out more information about licensing our V-Chip technologies or request a license, please complete and submit the following information form.

Email Address *

First Name *

Last Name *

Company *

Title

