

2. Defendant FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY is a Florida Profit Corporation, having its principal place of business at 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

3. Defendant FPL GROUP, INC. is a Florida Profit Corporation, having its principal place of business at 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*

5. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY. FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY is a Florida corporation, headquartered in Florida, regularly conducts business in the State of Florida and is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY has been and is doing business in this judicial district by manufacturing, distributing, marketing, using, selling and/or offering for sale its products including, but not limited to, products that practice the subject matter claimed in the patent involved in this action, in this judicial district and elsewhere

in the United States. FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY can be served with process through its registered agent, J. E. Leon, 9250 W. Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33174.

7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over FPL GROUP, INC. FPL GROUP, INC. is a Florida corporation, headquartered in Florida, regularly conducts business in the State of Florida and is subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. FPL GROUP, INC. has been and is doing business in this judicial district by manufacturing, distributing, marketing, using, selling and/or offering for sale its products including, but not limited to, products that practice the subject matter claimed in the patent involved in this action, in this judicial district and elsewhere in the United States. FPL GROUP, INC. can be served with process through its registered agent, J. E. Leon, 9250 W. Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33174.

8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b). Defendants are headquartered in this District, have done business in this District, committed acts of infringement in this District, and continue to commit acts of infringement in this District, all of which entitle SIPCO to relief.

PATENTS-IN-SUIT

9. SIPCO restates and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 8 of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference.

10. U.S. Patent No. 6,437,692 (the “‘692 Patent”), entitled “System And Method For Monitoring And Controlling Remote Devices,” was duly and legally issued on August 20, 2002 by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to StatSignal Systems, Inc., the assignee of the named inventors T. David Petite and Richard M. Huff. A true and correct copy of the ‘692 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

11. U.S. Patent No. 7,053,767 (the “‘767 Patent”), entitled “System And Method For Monitoring And Controlling Remote Devices,” was duly and legally issued on May 30, 2006 by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to StatSignal Systems, Inc., the assignee of the named inventors T. David Petite and Richard M. Huff. A true and correct copy of the ‘767 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

12. U.S. Patent No. 7,468,661 (the “‘661 Patent”), entitled “System And Method For Monitoring And Controlling Remote Devices,” was duly and legally issued on December 23, 2008 by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to Hunt Technologies, Inc., the assignee of the named inventors T. David Petite and Richard M. Huff. A true and correct copy of the ‘661 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

13. SIPCO is the sole owner of the entire right, title, and interest in the ‘692 Patent, the ‘767 Patent, and the ‘661 Patent (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”) by virtue of assignment, including all rights necessary to prosecute this case

and collect all damages, past, present and future, resulting from Defendants' infringement.

14. T. David Petite, the President of Plaintiff SIPCO, is one of two co-inventors of the technologies embodied in the Patents-in-Suit. Mr. Petite is a pioneer in the field of wireless technology, and his inventions are widely deployed in a variety of products and networks throughout the United States.

COUNT I

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 6,437,692

15. SIPCO restates and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 14 of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference.

16. Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe one or more claims of the '692 Patent, directly, contributorily, and/or by inducement, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in this country, and/or importing into this country, and inducing others to use, without license, certain products and services that consist of, employ and/or incorporate infringing wireless network products and services, including without limitation wireless network technology similar to that found in its Smart Grid system, known in part as the Energy Smart Miami ("ESM") initiative, and components thereof, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271. In particular, the infringing systems and components include, without

limitation, wireless network technology found in the utility meters, applications and control systems, wireless communications protocols, devices, network interface cards, computer devices, enabling software, data collection and processing, and associated communications platforms, gateways, and controls.

17. The acts of infringement of the '692 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, have caused damage to SIPCO, and SIPCO is entitled to recover from the Defendants, and each of them, the damages sustained by SIPCO as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial. The infringement of SIPCO's exclusive rights under the '692 Patent by Defendants, and each of them, will continue to damage SIPCO, causing irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

18. The Defendants, and each of them, have had actual or constructive knowledge of the '692 Patent, yet each of them continues to infringe said patent. The infringement of the '692 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, is willful and deliberate, entitling SIPCO to increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT II

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,053,767

19. SIPCO restates and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 18 of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference.

20. Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe one or more claims of the '767 Patent, directly, contributorily, and/or by inducement, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in this country, and/or importing into this country, and inducing others to use, without license, certain products and services that consist of, employ and/or incorporate infringing wireless network products and services, including without limitation wireless network technology similar to that found in its Smart Grid system, known in part as the Energy Smart Miami ("ESM") initiative, and components thereof, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271. In particular, the infringing systems and components include, without limitation, wireless network technology found in the utility meters, applications and control systems, wireless communications protocols, devices, network interface cards, computer devices, enabling software, data collection and processing, and associated communications platforms, gateways, and controls.

21. The acts of infringement of the '767 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, have caused damage to SIPCO, and SIPCO is entitled to recover

from the Defendants, and each of them, the damages sustained by SIPCO as a result of Defendant's wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial. The infringement of SIPCO's exclusive rights under the '767 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, will continue to damage SIPCO, causing irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

22. The Defendants, and each of them, have had actual or constructive knowledge of the '767 Patent, yet each of them continues to infringe said patent. The infringement of the '767 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, is willful and deliberate, entitling SIPCO to increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

COUNT III

INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. 7,468,661

23. SIPCO restates and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference.

24. Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe one or more claims of the '661 Patent, directly, contributorily, and/or by inducement, by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale in this country, and/or importing into this country, and inducing others to use, without license, certain products and services that consist of, employ and/or incorporate infringing wireless network

products and services, including without limitation wireless network technology similar to that found in its Smart Grid system, known in part as the Energy Smart Miami (“ESM”) initiative, and components thereof, in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271. In particular, the infringing systems and components include, without limitation, wireless network technology found in the utility meters, applications and control systems, wireless communications protocols, devices, network interface cards, computer devices, enabling software, data collection and processing, and associated communications platforms, gateways, and controls.

25. The acts of infringement of the ‘661 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, has caused damage to SIPCO, and SIPCO is entitled to recover from the Defendants, and each of them, the damages sustained by SIPCO as a result of Defendants’ wrongful acts in an amount subject to proof at trial. The infringement of SIPCO’s exclusive rights under the ‘661 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, will continue to damage SIPCO, causing irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless enjoined by this Court.

26. The Defendants, and each of them, have had actual or constructive knowledge of the ‘661 Patent, yet continues to infringe said patent. The infringement of the ‘661 Patent by the Defendants, and each of them, is willful and

deliberate, entitling SIPCO to increased damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284 and to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action under 35 U.S.C. § 285.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief against Defendants:

A. A judgment that Defendants, and each of them, have directly infringed the '692 Patent, contributorily infringed the '692 Patent, and/or induced infringement of the '692 Patent;

B. A judgment that Defendants, and each of them, have directly infringed the '767 Patent, contributorily infringed the '767 Patent, and/or induced infringement of the '767 Patent;

C. A judgment that Defendants, and each of them, have directly infringed the '661 Patent, contributorily infringed the '661 Patent, and/or induced infringement of the '661 Patent;

D. An award of all damages recoverable under the laws of the United States and the laws of the State of Florida in an amount to be proven at trial;

E. An award of treble damages against Defendants, and each of them, as a result of Defendant's willful infringement;

F. A preliminary, and thereafter permanent, injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, agents,

servants, employees, attorneys, and all others acting under, by or through them, from directly infringing, contributorily infringing, and inducing the infringement of the '692 Patent, as set forth herein;

G. A preliminary, and thereafter permanent, injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all others acting under, by or through them, from directly infringing, contributorily infringing, and inducing the infringement of the '767 Patent, as set forth herein;

H. A preliminary, and thereafter permanent, injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants, and each of them, and their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all others acting under, by or through them, from directly infringing, contributorily infringing, and inducing the infringement of the '661 Patent, as set forth herein;

I. A judgment and order requiring Defendants, and each of them, to pay Plaintiff pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the full amounts of the damages awarded;

J. A judgment requiring Defendants, and each of them, to pay the costs of this action (including all disbursements) and attorneys' fees as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 285, with prejudgment interest; and


K. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and equitable.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands that all issues so triable be determined by a jury.

Respectfully submitted, this 27th day of July, 2009.

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER
RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP



David George
(Florida Bar No. 898570)
Robert Robbins
(Florida Bar No. 572233)

120 East Palmetto Park Road
Suite 500
Boca Raton, FL 33432
(561) 750-3000 (telephone)
(561) 750-3364 (facsimile)
dgeorge@csgrr.com
rrobbins@csgrr.com

John C. Herman
Ryan K. Walsh
E. Joseph Benz III
Jason S. Jackson
**Coughlin Stoia Geller
Rudman & Robbins, LLP**
3424 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 1650
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(404) 504-6500 (telephone)
(404) 504-6501 (facsimile)
jherman@csgrr.com
rwalsh@csgrr.com
jbenz@csgrr.com
jjackson@csgrr.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
SIPCO, LLC

FILED by GME D.C.
 SEP 11 2009
 STEVEN M. LARIMORE
 CLERK U.S. DIST. CT.
 SFL 0604 MIAMI

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) **NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.**

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS
 SIPCO, LLC

09-22209

DEFENDANTS
 Florida Power & Light Company

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Fulton County, Georgia
 (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Palm Beach County, Florida
 (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
 John C. Herman
 Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins, LLP
 3424 Peachtree Road NE, Suite 1650 Atlanta, GA 30326

Attorneys (if known)
 CIV-MORENO
 J TORRES

(d) Check County Where Action Arose: MIAMI-DADE MONROE BROWARD PALM BEACH MARTIN ST. LUCIE INDIAN RIVER OKEECHOBEE HIGHLANDS

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)

2 U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus-Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395f) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition			

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Re-filed (see VI below) 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. RELATED/RE-FILED CASE(S).

a) Re-filed Case YES NO b) Related Cases YES NO

(See instructions second page): JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

VII. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and Write a Brief Statement of Cause (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
 35 U.S.C. 271 (Patent Infringement)

LENGTH OF TRIAL via 10 days estimated (for both sides to try entire case)

VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 **DEMAND \$** _____

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: Yes No

ABOVE INFORMATION IS TRUE & CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD: [Signature] DATE: July 24, 2009

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

AMOUNT 350 RECEIPT # 1005397 IFP