## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS:	Edith Ramirez, Chairwo Julie Brill Maureen K. Ohlhausen Joshua D. Wright Terrell McSweeny	man
In the Matter of	)	_
MPHJ TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS, LLC, a limited liability company;		Docket No. G
JAY MAC RUST, individually and as an off MPHJ TECHNOLOGY IN and	,	
FARNEY DANIELS, P.C a professional corporatio	•	)

## COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission ("Commiss")ohaving reason to believe that MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC, a limited liability company; Jay Mac Rust, individually and as an officer of MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC; and Farney Daniels, P. Orofessional corporation (collectively, "Respondents") have violated the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and it appearing to the Commission that this proceeding is in the public interest, alleges as follows:

1. Respondent MPHJ Technology Investments, L("ONPHJ") is a Delaware limited liability companywith a registered agent \$013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805. MPHJ has 101 subsidiaries, each of which is a Delaware limited liability company and each owhich has a registered agent at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.

- 2. Respondentlay Mac Rust is the sole member and manager of Mthd the sole manager of ach of MPHJ's 101 subsidiarie at all times material to this Complaint, acting alone or in concert with others, he has formulated, directed, controlled, had the authority to control, or participated in the acts and practice BHJ, including the acts and practice set forth in this Complaint. His principal place of business is 510 North Valley Mills Drive, Suite 505, Waco, Texas, 76710.
- 3. RespondentFarney Daniels, P.C., ("Farney Daniels") is a Texas professional corporation with its principal office or place of business at 800 South Austin Avenue, Suite 200, Georgetown, Texas, 78626.
- 4. The acts and practices to Respondents as alleged in this Complaint have been in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in Section 4 of the FTC 5Abt, S.C. § 44.

## RESPONDENTS' BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

- 5. MPHJ and the subsidiaries that it controls are Patent Assertion Entities. Patent Assertion Entities purchase atent rights and seek to generate revenue by licetosiong litigating against those who are or may be using patented technology.
- 6. In Septembe2012, MPHJ purchased from other Patent Assertion Entity, Project Paperless, LL, Call right, title, and interest to four U.S. pateraised one pending U.S. patent application the work of inventor Laurence C. Kle(inhe"Klein Patents") The four patents, U.S. Rent Nos 7,986,426; 6,771,381; 7,477,410; and 6,185,546; Application No. 13/182,857 (issued as Patent No. 8,488,173 in 2013) generally pertain to networked scanning systems. More particularly, Respondents assert that the Klein Patents, individually or in combination, cover certain computer management systems capable of transmitting electronic images, graphics, and/or documents through a communications network from a network addressable scanner, digital copier, or other multifunction peripheral to external devices, files, and applications.
- 7. Beginning in September 2012 and continuing through June 2013, the Respondents conducted a campaign promote and sell licenses for the Klein Patents through letters sent to thousands of small businesses located in all fifty states and the District of Columbia.

Respondents, including those for Veterinary Services, Lawn and Garden Services, Building Maintenance Serviceand MedicaLaboratories

- 14. In the first stage of the campaign, Respondents sent a letter in the name of one of MPHJ's various subsidiaries on letterhead featuring the name of that substitution (Letter). In each First LetterRespondents state that the entity identified as the sender is the licensing agent for the Klein Patents Eighty-one different subsidiary names were used over the length of Respondents' campaignAllLed, LLC; AbsMea, LLC; AccNum, LLC; AllOrd, LLC; AdzPro, LLC; ArdSan, LLC; ArdTec, LLC; AppVal, LLC; BavLin, LLC; BarMas, LLC; BetNam, LLC; BilOlt, LLC; BriPol, LLC; BruSed, LLC; BosTra, LLC; BunVic, LLC; CalLad, LLC; CapMat, LLC; CalNeb, LLC; CleOrv, LLC; ChaPac, LLC; CelSta, LLC; ComTim, LLC; CraVar, LLC; DelLog, LLC; DayMas, LLC; DesNot, LC; DreOcc, LLC; DucPla, LLC; DriSud, LLC; DraTom, LLC; DolVol, LLC; EliLand, LLC; ElaMon, LLC; EntNil, LLC; EleOde, LLC; EliPut, LLC; EstSto, LLC; EtaTri, LLC; EquiVas, LLC; FasLan, LLC; FraMor, LLC; FolNer, LLC; FenObe, LLC; FanPar, LLC; FreSta, LLC; FloVis, LLC; GreLea, LLC; GraMet, LLC; GosNel, LLC; GanOrb, LLC; GanPan, LLC; GamSta, LLC; GenTro, LLC; GimVea, LLC; HunLos, LLC; HanMea, LLC; HarNol, LLC; HadOpp, LLC; HeaPle, LLC; HorSan, LLC; HurTom, LLC; HasVen, LLC; InnLost, LLC; IsaMai, LL; CnaNur, LLC; IndOrp, LLC; IntPar, LLC; InkSen, LLC; IntTen, LLC; IbiVen, LLC; JusLem, LLC; JonMor, LLC; JitNom, LLC; JanOrt, LLC; JudPar, LLC; JunSpe, LLC; JabTre, LLC; JamVor, LLC; and Networked Scanning Solutions, LLC.
- 15. Each First Letter statebat the recipient is likelyinfringing the Klein Patents by using common office equipmented that "we are contacting you to initiate discussions reonb y1oak, ,aen y
  - 65. re cuar13(s)-1(e)4( of)3 ute cain,uteREsndent-24(s)-1 u(s)-1(e)4d d(i)

- 25. Over the course of the campaign, the Respondents used different versions of the Third Letterand Complaint that share a core text. One such Third LetterComplaint redacted to removeertainname and address informant, is attached as Exhible.
- 26. Beginning in December 2012 and continuing through May 2013, Respondents sent Third Letters to approximately 4,870 small businesses located in all fifty states and the District of Columbia On several dates during this period, Respondents sent versions of these Third Letters to hundreds of small businesses in a single transpectation on April 1, 2013, Respondents sent approximately 1,718 Third Letters threatening to file a compression infringementagainst small businesse cipients located in fortynine states Respondents did not hear from the recipient within two weeks of the date of the letter
- 27. Respondents MPHJ, Farney Daniels, and Rust were aware of and approved or ratified the contents of allhree letters used in Respondents' campaign.
- 28. Respondent Farney Daniels waware of the contents of the First Lestend explicitly or implicitly referenced and incorporated the representations in those letters in Second and Third Letters sent in the me of Farney Daniels.

Respondents' Representation Concerning Substantial Sales

29.

those First Letters state that the price determined through the responses of "[m]any companies" was "a payment of \$1,000 per employee."

- 31. From September 2012 through February 2013, the Respondents sent to small businesses located in all fifty states approxinya 181 First Letters that contain the representations concerning substantial sales of licenses 161ethe Patents identified in Paragraphs 29–30.
- 32. When Respondents sent the first 7,366 of the set Letters Respondents had not sold a singleticense for the Klein Patentsrough Respondents' nationwide campaign of letters.
- 33. When Respondents sent the next 1,077 of these First Lettersondents had sold a license for the Klein Patents

37. a Tc 02(a)lo	Each ThirdLetter was accompanied by a Complainthe Complaint generally dTw [cpp2(atip2(np2(e)-6dp2(f)5(ip2(r)5(thP)-8e)-6 f)5(e)-6dp)-8e()-6l jup2(dp2(ic)-6i()-6l

Respondents' letterand were not prepared to initiate and did not intend to initiate legal action imminently. Therefore, the representations set forth in Paragraphar 2 alse or misleading

44. The acts or practices of the Respondents as alleged inchiplant constitute deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

THEREFORE, the Federal Trade Commission this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2014, has issued this complaint against Respondents

By the Commission.

Donald S. Clark Secretary

SEAL: ISSUED: