1 2 3 4 5 6	William Sloan Coats (State Bar No. 94864) Vickie L. Feeman (State Bar No. 177487) Gabriel M. Ramsey (State Bar No. 209218) ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE L 1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 614-7400 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401 Attorneys for Plaintiff Gracenote, Inc.	LP
7		ES DISTRICT COURT
8		
9		TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	OAKLA	AND DIVISION
11	,	
12	GRACENOTE, INC., a Delaware corporation,	CASE NO. C 02-3162 CW
13	Plaintiff,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
14	v.	1. BREACH OF CONTRACT 2. UNFAIR COMPETITION
15	MUSICMATCH, INC., a Washington	3. TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT 4. INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH
16	corporation,	PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE 5. NEGLIGENT INTERFERENCE WITH
17	Defendant.	PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE 6. PATENT INFRINGEMENT
18		
19		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
∠ 0		

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY

Plaintiff, Gracenote, Inc. (formerly known as CDDB, Inc.) (hereinafter "Gracenote") through its undersigned counsel and by way of Complaint against Defendant MusicMatch, Inc. (hereinafter "MusicMatch") hereby alleges and avers as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. This is an action for patent infringement and trademark infringement committed by MusicMatch that arises under the United States patent laws (35 U.S.C. §§ 1 et seq.) and trademark laws (15 U.S.C. § 1111 et seq.). Therefore, this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338 and 15 U.S.C. § 1121. This is also an action for breach of contract, unfair competition and intentional and/or negligent interference with prospective economic advantage. Accordingly, this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 2. On information and belief, MusicMatch maintains a principal place of business within the State of California, maintains an Internet website availing itself of the privilege of conducting business in the State of California, is doing business and is actively soliciting business in the State of California and has undertaken acts with knowledge that such acts would harm a corporation in California. Therefore, this Court has personal jurisdiction over MusicMatch.
- 3. Because a substantial part of the events giving rise to Gracenote's claims occurred in this judicial district and because the intellectual property at issue is situated in this judicial district, venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).
- 4. MusicMatch and Gracenote have agreed and given consent that jurisdiction and venue for all matters relating to the "Agreement or the parties" will be exclusively in the federal and state courts within San Francisco or Alameda Counties in the State of California.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

5. Because Plaintiff Gracenote has a place of business in Alameda County, because a substantial part of the events which give rise to Gracenote's claims occurred in Alameda County and because the intellectual property at issue is situated in Alameda County, this action should be and has been assigned to the Oakland division of this Court pursuant to Civil Local Rules 3-2(c) and 3-2(d).

.

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

THE PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff, Gracenote, Inc., is a Delaware corporation with its place of business at 2141 Fourth Street, Berkeley, California 94710. Gracenote is in the business of developing technology and offering products and services relating to music recognition, content delivery and database management. Among other things, Gracenote is engaged in the business of creating, modifying, and providing access to Gracenote's copyrighted database ("CDDB® Database"); creating and modifying computer programs, including computer programs that are used to access and modify the CDDB Database; and distributing, selling and/or licensing the distribution and sale of its compilation and computer programs, or arranging to do so, in the United States and around the world.
- The first large compilation of digital music file and music compact disc ("CD") information accessible to users of digital music file and CD player software, and Gracenote is known as the pioneer and industry leader in the creation of digital music file and music CD databases. Digital music file and music CD player software can be used to play a digital music file or a music CD that is placed in the CD drive of a personal computer or other devices that can access the CDDB Database (e.g., via the Internet). Digital music file and CD information includes, for example, information about a particular music file or music CD, such as artist, album title, and track and title information, that is not stored initially in the music file or on the CD itself. Gracenote also operates commercial websites, including the website located at http://www.gracenote.com.
- 8. Gracenote employs many engineers and computer scientists devoted to the development and design of its products. In order to protect its intellectual property rights, including its innovations relating to music recognition and delivery of content related to music, Gracenote has obtained numerous United States Patents. Gracenote's patent portfolio includes U.S. Patent No. 6,230,192 (the "192 Patent") entitled "Method And System For Accessing Remote Data Based On Playback Of Recordings," and U.S. Patent No. 6,330,593 (the "'593 Patent") entitled "System For Collecting Use Data Related To Playback Of Recordings."

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY

Gracenote further protects its intellectual property and proprietary information through its license agreements, which restrict the use of Gracenote's technology and information.

9. On information and belief, Defendant MusicMatch is a Washington corporation having a place of business in San Diego, California, that is in the business of developing software and services relating to music recognition, delivery of music and delivery of other online content. MusicMatch sells and distributes certain computer software (including but not limited to the "MusicMatch Jukebox" product) for playing digital music files and CDs, making digital music files and CDs, managing collections of digital music files and CDs and delivering content associated with music recordings fixed in digital music files or CDs. MusicMatch also operates commercial websites, including the website located at http://www.musicmatch.com.

FACTS

MusicMatch's And Gracenote's Technology

- product) enable users to play digital music files and CDs, make digital music files and CDs and manage collections of digital music files and CDs. MusicMatch's software applications also enable the delivery of content associated with digital music files or CDs being played by end users using such MusicMatch applications. MusicMatch's applications perform these functions, in part, by (i) accessing remote data based on playback of a recording by end users and (ii) by collecting a substantial amount of "use data" related to playback of recordings by end users along with other information, in order to develop and maintain extensive music listening behavior profiles of uniquely identifiable end users, in order to deliver personalized content to them. As enumerated at http://www.musicmatch.com/info/terms/privacy.htm, MusicMatch collects from its end users: "personal information," (e.g. name and email address), "demographic information," "compact disc identification information," "listening history," and "genre preference."
- 11. Under a license agreement between the parties, MusicMatch's software applications (including the "MusicMatch Jukebox" product) have enabled access to Gracenote's CDDB Database through client software ("CDDB Client") incorporated into the MusicMatch

application by means of Gracenote's proprietary software development kit ("CDDB² SDK").

- 12. Gracenote's CDDB Database is an electronic database stored on a computer server, which has been developed over time at substantial effort and expense, and which presently contains data records relating to nearly 1.5 million albums and more than 17.8 million tracks. For example, a data record can contain information about a particular digital music file or music CD, including artist name, album title and track titles. A data record for a particular music CD can contain relatively unique table of contents ("TOC") information. A "TOC" is a series of numbers representing the track offsets on a CD, including silence between the tracks, and is measured cumulatively in "frames" of 1/75th of a second. A data record for a particular music CD can also contain other disc identification ("disc ID") information. A data record for a particular digital music file can also contain unique identifier ("unique ID") information.
- 13. Gracenote's licensees, such as MusicMatch, use Gracenote's CDDB Client to access the CDDB Database. The CDDB Client is an application plug-in, in object code form, that provides the user interface and lookup functions for accessing the CDDB Database and CDDB data through the Internet. From 1998 through 1999 CDDB access was obtained using the CDDB¹ protocol. Since 1999, a CDDB Client has conformed to the CDDB² server protocol.
- 14. By implementing Gracenote's CDDB Client and thus enabling access to the CDDB Database, MusicMatch's application has been able to quickly provide to end users the following information about CDs or other digital music files: artist, title and other related information about digital music files and music CDs. For example, the MusicMatch software can control playing a digital music file or music CD and can determine, based on digital music file information (e.g. unique ID) or CD information (e.g. TOC or other disc ID information) whether there is a data record matching the digital music file or CD in the CDDB Database, and if so, it can send information from the matching data record to the MusicMatch software for display to the end-user.
- 15. This information has allowed MusicMatch's software to perform music recognition functions, in order to enhance the playback of music by MusicMatch's software, to

7

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28 ORRICK HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE LLP

enhance the ability of end users to manage music collections and also to deliver content related to digital music files and music CDs being played by end users.

MusicMatch's "MusicMatch Jukebox" product has been favorably reviewed by 16. software critics for including access to Gracenote's CDDB Database and thus allowing end users to skip the tedious process of entering artist and title information when making a copy of a digital music file or music CD. MusicMatch's success with its product has been made possible in part by implementation of Gracenote's music recognition technology.

The Agreement Between MusicMatch And Gracenote

- 17. In 1998, MusicMatch first licensed Gracenote's service pursuant to an agreement between the parties, which was negotiated at arms length. Under the terms of that license, Gracenote's service relied upon and conformed to the CDDB¹ protocol. Under the initial agreement, MusicMatch was not required to pay Gracenote any license fee for Gracenote's service. During the parties' negotiations regarding this agreement it was made clear that eventually Gracenote would require that MusicMatch pay license fees for Gracenote's service.
- 18. In 1999, Gracenote's service was expanded to rely upon the CDDB² protocol. The CDDB² protocol offered additional flexibility, scalability and functionality such as the ability to support extended data, security measures (e.g. encryption), more efficient interaction with Gracenote's database and support of double-byte characters (to support multiple languages). Accordingly, the parties terminated the original agreement, properly and pursuant to its terms, and began negotiating terms of a new agreement with MusicMatch to license the CDDB² service.
- 19. On December 31, 1999, as a result of arms-length negotiations, Gracenote and MusicMatch entered into the "CDDB2 SDK and DATABASE ACCESS AGREEMENT" (the "Agreement"), which governs the utilization and implementation of Gracenote's technology and resources in MusicMatch applications.
- 20. Under the Agreement, Gracenote licensed to MusicMatch the ability to enable end-user access to Gracenote's CDDB Database using Gracenote's proprietary CDDB² protocol and Gracenote's "CDDB2 SDK" so that MusicMatch could implement the CDDB Client into

MusicMatch products. Under the Agreement, MusicMatch would be charged license fees, as a result of the expanded functionality of CDDB², as the parties had contemplated all along.

<u>MusicMatch's Breach Of The Agreement</u> MusicMatch's Continued Duplication And Distribution Of Gracenote Enabled Products

- 21. The Agreement's initial term extended until December 31, 2001. On August 30, 2001, Gracenote approached MusicMatch regarding negotiation of a new agreement to take effect after expiration of the initial term. However, MusicMatch refused to negotiate terms of a new agreement and accordingly, pursuant to Paragraph 15(b) of the Agreement, Gracenote gave written notice to MusicMatch that the Agreement would expire at the end of the initial term (i.e. December 31, 2001).
- 22. On October 12, 2001, MusicMatch gave Gracenote written notice of its desire to extend the Agreement for an additional six months past the December 31, 2001 expiration date, as contemplated by Paragraph 16 of the Agreement. Under this extension provision, by March 31, 2002, MusicMatch was required to discontinue duplication of CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications and was required to use commercially reasonable efforts to have its OEM customers discontinue any duplication of CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications. Under this provision, MusicMatch was allowed to distribute remaining inventory in the channels until that date (March 31, 2002) and MusicMatch's OEMs were allowed to continue to distribute remaining physical inventory of licensed applications. Further, according to Paragraph 16 of the Agreement, after June 30, 2002, Gracenote need not support any new users of MusicMatch's software.
- 23. On March 28, 2002, MusicMatch informed Gracenote that MusicMatch would "be terminating the distribution of Gracenote enabled applications by 31 March 2002 per the previous contract."
- 24. Gracenote is informed and believes that, although MusicMatch purported to no longer distribute Gracenote-enabled applications, MusicMatch has continued to duplicate and/or has allowed its OEM customers to duplicate CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications, in violation of Paragraph 16 of the Agreement. Gracenote is informed and believes that, after March 31,

2002, MusicMatch allowed one or more of its OEM customers to continue to duplicate CDDB²Enabled licensed applications from a non-volatile golden master application image resident on the
OEMs' servers and to distribute those duplicated applications. Gracenote is informed and
believes that MusicMatch has, therefore, not used commercially reasonable efforts to have its
OEM customers discontinue duplication of CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications.

<u>MusicMatch's Breach Of The Agreement</u> <u>MusicMatch's Music Recognition System Based On Gracenote's Proprietary Data</u>

- 25. From the outset, Gracenote was concerned that because MusicMatch's application would have access to Gracenote's valuable data, MusicMatch might attempt to steal the data and use it to build its own alternative music recognition system. Accordingly, the Agreement specifically contemplated intentional and bad faith conduct by MusicMatch regarding Gracenote's technology and proprietary information.
- 26. Indeed, the Agreement sets forth a permissive structure by which all allowable uses of Gracenote's proprietary data are set forth and all other uses which are not expressly allowed in the Agreement are forbidden. Section 9 of the Agreement is titled "Negative Covenants and Restrictions" and states that MusicMatch "further agrees as follows:".

 Specifically, in Paragraph 9(j) of the Agreement, MusicMatch agreed that it "WILL NOT USE OR EXPLOIT THE CDDB DATABASE, CDDB DATA, END USER DATA OR THE CDDB SERVER, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED HEREIN, ALL OTHER USE IS PROHIBITED." Similarly, MusicMatch agreed in Paragraph 9(c) that "[e]xcept as expressly set forth in this Agreement, you will not exploit the CDDB Database or SDK in any way or for any commercial gain." MusicMatch agreed to this structure after extensive negotiation with Gracenote.
- 27. Further, numerous specific provisions of the Agreement clearly provide express limitations on MusicMatch's conduct in anticipation of a potential situation in which MusicMatch would steal Gracenote's data (to which its end user's had access during the term of Agreement) and use it to build its own alternative music recognition system. Importantly, the Agreement sets forth limitations on MusicMatch's right to collect and store Gracenote's data (which MusicMatch

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

ORRICK HERRINGTON & Sutcliffe LLP had access to via its Licensed Application) and to use and/or associate any Gracenote data in ways that would allow MusicMatch to improperly build a music recognition system based on Gracenote's innovation and labor. Further, anticipating potential violation of these provisions and the harm which would be done by such breach, the Agreement sets forth remedies for such breach, including injunctive relief.

- 28. Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch has engaged in precisely the conduct that the structure and limitations of the Agreement were designed to prevent. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that MusicMatch has built an alternative music recognition system that relies upon, contains and/or uses Gracenote's proprietary information in breach of the Agreement.
- 29. Specifically, Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has developed and is now using its own client software which enables access to an alternative music database, which is an unauthorized derivative work based upon the CDDB Database and which was created through violations of the Agreement. Further, Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, in violation of the Agreement, this client software and alternative music database rely upon, contain and/or use Gracenote's trademarks and CDDB proprietary information (including but not limited to TOC data and unique ID data) which were previously licensed under the Agreement.
- 30. Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch's alternative recognition system breaches provisions of the Agreement, as set forth below.
- As stated, the Agreement contains provisions that MusicMatch "WILL NOT USE 31. OR EXPLOIT THE CDDB DATABASE, CDDB DATA, END USER DATA OR THE CDDB SERVER, EXCEPT AS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED HEREIN, ALL OTHER USE IS PROHIBITED" (Paragraph 9(j)) and that "[e]xcept as expressly set forth in this Agreement" MusicMatch "will not exploit the CDDB Database or SDK in any way or for any commercial gain." (Paragraph 9(c)). Further, in the Agreement, MusicMatch explicitly recognizes (in paragraph 10) that "[t]he CDDB SDK, the CDDB Database and CDDB Server" are Gracenote's

"sole property."

32. Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch has used or exploited the CDDB Database, CDDB Data, End User Data and/or the CDDB Server in ways not expressly permitted in the Agreement. Gracenote is further informed and believes that MusicMatch has and is currently exploiting the CDDB Database and/or SDK for commercial gain, in ways other than those expressly set forth in the Agreement.

- 33. Moreover, Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch is in breach of numerous express limitations of the Agreement relating to MusicMatch's use of Gracenote's proprietary data, as described more fully below. Indeed, Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch has collected and stored Gracenote's data and has used and associated Gracenote's data, in violation of provisions described below, in order to develop its own music recognition functionality. This is precisely the conduct that the limiting provisions and specific negative covenants of the Agreement were designed to prevent.
- 34. The Agreement contains a provision, in Schedule G, that MusicMatch agrees not to associate or accompany "TOC or other disk identification data" with "the text-only portion of CDDB Data or End-User Data." Schedule G of the Agreement "survives termination of the Agreement."
- 35. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has associated or accompanied TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB Data or End-User Data. Gracenote is informed and believes that making these data associations, MusicMatch has been able to create its own alternative music database.
- 36. The Agreement contains a provision (Paragraph 9(a)(ii)) that MusicMatch agrees that its "Licensed Application shall not have or enable any functionality that uploads or permits the transmission of CDDB Data to anyone other than CDDB," except as expressly set forth in Schedules G and H of the Agreement.
- 37. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has associated TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB

Data and/or End-User Data and therefore that, MusicMatch's application has and/or enables
functionality that uploads or permits transmission of CDDB Data to parties other than CDDB.
Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch uploaded or transmitted CDDB Data to
MusicMatch's own servers or servers controlled by MusicMatch in order to create an alternative
music recognition system.

- 38. The Agreement contains a provision (Paragraph 9(a)(iii)) that MusicMatch agrees "not to upload, aggregate, transfer, transmit, or collect CDDB Data or End-User Data" except as expressly set forth in Schedules G and H of the Agreement.
- 39. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has associated TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB Data and/or End-User Data and has therefore uploaded, aggregated, transferred, transmitted and/or collected CDDB Data and/or End-User Data. Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch has uploaded, aggregated, transferred, transmitted and/or collected CDDB Data and/or End-User Data in order to create an alternative music recognition system.
- 40. The Agreement contains a provision (Paragraph 9(b)(i)) that MusicMatch agrees not to "use CDDB Data to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to electronic commerce sites or for the purpose of promoting or marketing goods or services to End-Users," except as expressly set forth in Schedules G and H of the Agreement.
- 41. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has associated TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB Data and/or End-User Data for the purpose of using CDDB Data to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users and/or other persons to electronic commerce sites and for the purpose of promoting or marketing goods or services to End-Users.
- 42. The Agreement contains a provision (Paragraph 9(b)(ii)) that MusicMatch agrees not to "use CDDB Data to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to content or services accessed on the Internet that are related to particular CD titles, tracks, artists or music categories," except as expressly set forth in Schedules G and H of the

Agreement.

- 43. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has associated TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB Data and/or End-User Data for the purpose of using CDDB Data to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to content or services accessed on the Internet that are related to particular CD titles, tracks, artists or music categories.
- 44. The Agreement contains a provision (Paragraph 9(e)), that MusicMatch's "Licensed Application may not be intentionally designed or enabled to be used together with any other program to accomplish functions or uses forbidden by this Agreement."
- 45. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch's Licensed Application is being intentionally designed and/or enabled to be used together with other programs to accomplish functions or uses forbidden by the Agreement.
- 46. The Agreement contains a provision, in Schedule A, that MusicMatch's "Licensed Application will not intentionally be enabled to transmit Files and associated Tags to a portable Electronic Music Player Device unless such portable Electronic Music Player Device either (i) has no capacity to display such information (e.g. Diamond Rio PMP300) or (ii) has the capacity to display such information and is manufactured by a company that has entered into a written branding agreement with CDDB (e.g. RCA Lyra)."
- 47. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch's Licensed Application is intentionally being enabled to transmit Files and associated Tags to portable Electronic Music Player Devices which have the capacity to display such information and are manufactured by companies that have not entered into a written branding agreement with CDDB.
- 48. The Agreement contains a provision, in Schedule H, that MusicMatch agrees that in each MP3 file created by MusicMatch's Licensed Application, that the Licensed Application "shall embed a CDDB Unique ID" as defined in the Agreement.
 - 49. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, in MP3 files

-12-

created by MusicMatch's Licensed Application, the Licensed Application fails to embed a CDDB Unique ID as expressly provided for in Schedule H of the Agreement.

- 50. The Agreement contains a provision (paragraph 9(d)) that MusicMatch agrees not to "use or permit the use of the trademarks, trade names or other designations of CDDB" except as specified in the Agreement or as may be stated in trademark use guidelines that Gracenote may issue from time to time.
- 51. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch is using or permitting the use of trademarks, trade names or other designations of CDDB in a manner other than that specified in the Agreement or in any trademark use guidelines issued by Gracenote.
- 52. The Agreement contains a provision (paragraph 5(c)) that requires that "the Licensed Application, when accessing the CDDB Server to obtain data or when sending data to the CDDB Server, must do so directly, without first accessing any other site or IP address (other than an End-User's internal network's proxy server)" and requires that MusicMatch "may not redirect queries to [its] own site or any other server or otherwise interfere with the operation of the CDDB Client."
- 53. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch has caused its Licensed Application to access the CDDB Server to obtain data and/or send data to the CDDB Server in a manner other than direct access, has caused such Licensed Application to first access other sites and/or IP addresses (other than an End-User's internal network's proxy server) during access to the CDDB Server, has redirected queries of the CDDB Server to MusicMatch's own site and/or other servers and has otherwise interfered with operation of the CDDB client.
- 54. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch has caused Gracenote irreparable harm by building an alternative music recognition system which relies upon, contains and/or uses Gracenote's proprietary information in breach of the Agreement, as described above. Specifically, Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that by building an alternative music recognition system in breach of numerous provisions of the

28
ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP

Agreement, MusicMatch has been able to secure business relationships and contracts that would otherwise have been secured by Gracenote.

- 55. For example, on July 20, 2000 Gracenote announced that its CDDB music recognition service would be used to enable music recognition functionality in Apple Macintosh media player applications. On July 12, 2002, after MusicMatch had improperly implemented its own music recognition functionality in breach of the Agreement, MusicMatch announced that its "Jukebox" application (including music recognition service) would be shipped with every Apple iPod device. Similarly, it was recently announced that the iPod device for Windows would use MusicMatch software to enable music recognition. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that but for existence of music recognition functionality in MusicMatch's product, in breach of the Agreement, that Gracenote rather than MusicMatch would have secured this business relationship and contract.
- 56. The Agreement provides that all provisions of the Agreement relating to the CDDB² SDK, CDDB Database, CDDB Servers, CDDB Data, End-User Data or restrictions on use thereof or relating to Gracenote's intellectual property are such that breach would cause Gracenote immediate and irreparable harm. The Agreement further provides that in case of breach, Gracenote is entitled to seek temporary, preliminary and final injunctive relief, in addition to such other relief as may be available.
- 57. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch has built its alternative music recognition system by breaching provisions of the Agreement relating to the CDDB² SDK, CDDB Database, CDDB Servers, CDDB Data, End-User Data or restrictions on use thereof or relating to Gracenote's intellectual property. Accordingly, Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch has caused Gracenote irreparable harm.
- 58. The Agreement provides that Gracenote may recover lost profits, lost savings or other incidental, consequential, punitive, special, or exemplary damages in amounts in excess of amounts paid or due to Gracenote under the Agreement, in the event that MusicMatch

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28 ORRICK HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE LLP

intentionally and in bad faith violates express restrictions on use of CDDB Data and End User Data in the Agreement.

- 59. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that MusicMatch has intentionally and in bad faith violated express restrictions on use of CDDB Data and End User Data in the Agreement.
- 60. As set forth below, MusicMatch is in material breach of the Agreement and has engaged in unfair competition against Gracenote. Thus, Gracenote is filing the present action to enforce its rights against MusicMatch.

MusicMatch's Interference With Gracenote's Economic Relationships

- 61. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that when end-users install versions 7.1 and higher of MusicMatch's Jukebox product, such installation interferes with end-user registrations of other Gracenote-enabled products on the end-user's computer.
- 62. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the interfering behavior of MusicMatch's product includes, but is not limited to, overwriting or deleting registrations of other Gracenote-enabled products on an end-user computer and causing other Gracenote-enabled applications on an end-user computer to re-register with a new user ID.
- 63. Gracenote gave notice to MusicMatch of this interfering behavior of the MusicMatch Jukebox application on July 9, 2002. However, upon information and belief, MusicMatch has neither acknowledged such behavior nor caused its products (including MusicMatch Jukebox versions 7.1 and 7.2) to cease this interfering behavior.
- 64. The interfering behavior of MusicMatch's product causes harm to Gracenote by confusing consumers of Gracenote-enabled products, which will attribute errors and the need to re-register Gracenote-enabled products to Gracenote. The behavior of MusicMatch's product also harms Gracenote by causing developers that pay Gracenote per end-user registration to be billed twice for the same end-user, which would not occur but for the interference of MusicMatch's product.
 - 65. As set forth below, by means of this behavior of MusicMatch's product,

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28 HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE LLP

SILICON VALLEY

MusicMatch has engaged in unfair competition against Gracenote and has interfered with Gracenote's economic relationships.

MusicMatch's Infringement Of Gracenote's Trademark

- 66. Gracenote (f/k/a CDDB, Inc.) is the owner of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 2,361,355, filed on August 7, 1998 and issued on April 4, 2000 for the CDDB word mark for use in connection with computer services, namely, providing an on-line computer database in the field of music. This registration, duly and legally issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is valid and subsisting. Gracenote uses the notice of registration, "®", with its CDDB word mark pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1111.
- 67. MusicMatch has recognized that the CDDB word mark is Gracenote's intellectual property and that Gracenote owns the CDDB word mark, in paragraph 2(m), paragraph 10 and Schedule B of the Agreement between the parties.
- 68. Gracenote has priority of use for the CDDB word mark based on its registrations and has continuously used the CDDB word mark in United States interstate and foreign commerce in connection with, including but not limited to, computer services providing on-line computer databases in the field of music.
- 69. Gracenote markets, sells and licenses products and services related to on-line computer databases in the field of music bearing the CDDB word mark. Products enabled by Gracenote's services relating to on-line computer databases in the field of music also bear the CDDB word mark.
- 70. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, MusicMatch has made unauthorized use and is currently making unauthorized use of the CDDB word mark in connection with MusicMatch's own client software which enables access to an alternative music database.
- 71. MusicMatch intends to use and uses the CDDB word mark to create a strong likelihood of confusion due to the similarity of goods on which the mark is used or intended to be used and the similarity of channels of trade.

Orrick Herrington

& SUTCLIFFE LLP

- 72. MusicMatch's use of the CDDB word mark in connection with MusicMatch's client software which enables access to an alternative music database is likely to cause confusion or mistake or deception of purchasers, consumers and the general public as to the source or origin of MusicMatch's on-line computer database services accessed by MusicMatch's client software. Purchasers and the general public are likely to purchase, view, use or receive MusicMatch's software or services, believing that they are enabled by Gracenote's computer database services, or associated or affiliated with Gracenote.
- 73. Because of the confusion as to source engendered by MusicMatch's use of the CDDB word mark, Gracenote's valuable goodwill with respect to its CDDB word mark is at the mercy of MusicMatch, and the quality (or lack thereof) of MusicMatch's related goods.
- 74. Gracenote is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that despite MusicMatch's knowledge of Gracenote's prior rights in the CDDB word mark for related services, MusicMatch has continued to promote related services using the CDDB word mark.
- 75. The various practices described herein threaten irreparable injury to Gracenote's business, goodwill, and reputation with respect to its CDDB word mark.
- 76. MusicMatch's conduct is continuing and will continue unless restrained by the Court. Unless MusicMatch is enjoined from engaging in the wrongful conduct described above, Gracenote will suffer irreparable injury and further harm. Gracenote has no adequate remedy at law, and in the alternative, Gracenote has been damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

MusicMatch's Infringement Of Gracenote's Patents

- 77. Gracenote continues to strive for further improvement in the development of music recognition, content delivery and database management applications and, to this end, employs many engineers devoted to research and design. In order to protect its intellectual property rights, Gracenote has obtained numerous patents in the United States and abroad.
- 78. Gracenote's patent portfolio includes numerous U.S. patents that cover many music recognition, content delivery and database management applications, including applications which access remote data based on playback of a recording and applications which

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28 ORRICK HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE LLP

SILICON VALLEY

collect use data related to playback of recordings.

79. The present action involves MusicMatch's infringement of two patents owned by Gracenote that cover various fundamental aspects of music recognition, content delivery and database management. Specifically, Gracenote asserts that MusicMatch infringes the following two U.S. patents:

U.S. Patent No.	Inventor	<u>Title</u>
6,230,192 ("the '192 patent")	Roberts, et al.	Method And System For Accessing Remote Data Based On Playback Of Recordings
6,330,593 ("the '593 patent")	Roberts, et al.	System For Collecting Use Data Related To Playback Of Recordings

- Gracenote is the owner of all rights granted by the '192 patent and '593 patent. 80.
- 81. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch has developed and offered for sale software and services relating to music recognition and delivery of music and other online content which performs, without authorization from Gracenote, methods and processes covered by Gracenote's '192 patent and '593 patent. As set forth below, the system MusicMatch has developed and offered for sale infringes Gracenote's patents. Thus, Gracenote is filing the present patent infringement action to enforce its intellectual property rights against MusicMatch.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 82. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 - 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 83. The Agreement requires that MusicMatch refrain from: (a) associating or accompanying "TOC or other disk identification data" with "the text-only portion of CDDB Data or End-User Data;" (b) creating an application that has and/or enables "any functionality that uploads or permits the transmission of CDDB Data to anyone other than CDDB;" (c) uploading, aggregating, transferring, transmitting, and/or collecting CDDB Data and/or End User Data (except as expressly permitted in the Agreement); (d) using CDDB Data "to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to electronic commerce sites or for the

	ĮĮ
1	p
2	p
3	d
4	ti
5	е
6	е
7	v
8	iı
9	N
10	n
11	G
12	τ
13	c
14	0
15	C
16	d
17	li

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

ourpose of promoting or marketing goods or services to End-Users" (except as expressly permitted by the Agreement); (e) except as expressly permitted, using CDDB Data "to enable or lirect the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to content or services accessed on he Internet that are related to particular CD titles, tracks, artists or music categories;" (f) exploiting "the CDDB Database and/or SDK for commercial gain" beyond what the Agreement expressly permits; (g) intentionally designing and/or enabling its application "to be used together with any other program to accomplish functions or uses forbidden by this Agreement;" (h) ntentionally enabling its application to transmit Files and associated Tags to portable Electronic Music Player Devices which have the capacity to display such information and which are nanufactured by a company that has not entered into a written branding agreement with CDDB; i) creating MP3 files by means of its application which do not contain an embedded CDDB Jnique ID; (j) using or permitting the use of the trademarks, trade names or other designations of CDDB except as specified in the Agreement or as may be stated in trademark use guidelines that Gracenote may issue from time to time; and (k) causing the Licensed Application to access the CDDB Server to obtain data or when sending data to the CDDB Server in a manner other than lirect access, such as by first accessing any other site or IP address (other than an End-User's nternal network's proxy server), redirecting queries to its own site or any other server or otherwise interfering with operation of the CDDB client.

- 84. The Agreement requires that MusicMatch discontinue any duplication of CDDB²Enabled licensed applications by March 31, 2002 and that MusicMatch use commercially
 reasonable efforts to have its OEM customers discontinue duplication of CDDB²-Enabled
 licensed applications by March 31, 2002.
- 85. The Agreement provides that all provisions of the Agreement relating to the CDDB² SDK, CDDB Database, CDDB Servers, CDDB Data, End-User Data or restrictions on use thereof or relating to Gracenote's intellectual property are such that breach would cause Gracenote immediate and irreparable harm. The Agreement further provides that in case of breach, Gracenote is entitled to seek temporary, preliminary and final injunctive relief, in addition

to such other relief as may be available.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 86. The Agreement provides that Gracenote may recover lost profits, lost savings or other incidental, consequential, punitive, special, or exemplary damages in amounts in excess of amounts paid or due to Gracenote under the Agreement, in the event that MusicMatch intentionally and in bad faith violates express restrictions on use of CDDB Data and End User Data in the Agreement.
 - 87. Gracenote has performed all of its obligations under the Agreement.
- 88. Upon information and belief, in and among other breaches, MusicMatch has unjustifiably and inexcusably breached its obligations under the Agreement: (a) by associating TOC and/or other compact disc identification data with the text-only portion of CDDB Data and/or End-User Data; (b) by creating an application that has and/or enables functionality that uploads or permits transmission of CDDB Data to parties other than CDDB; (c) by uploading. aggregating, transferring, transmitting, and/or collecting CDDB Data and/or End User Data in ways not permitted by the Agreement; (d) by using CDDB Data to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users and/or other persons to electronic commerce sites and for the purpose of promoting or marketing goods or services to End-Users in ways not permitted by the Agreement; (e) by using CDDB Data impermissibly to enable or direct the routing or linking of End-Users or any other person to content or services accessed on the Internet that are related to particular CD titles, tracks, artists or music categories; (f) by exploiting the CDDB Database and/or SDK for commercial gain; (g) by intentionally designing and/or enabling its application to be used together with another program or other programs to accomplish functions forbidden by the Agreement; (h) by intentionally enabling its application to transmit Files and associated Tags to portable Electronic Music Player Devices which have the capacity to display such information and which are manufactured by a company that has not entered into a written branding agreement with CDDB; (i) by creating MP3 files by means of its application which do not contain an embedded CDDB Unique ID; (i) by using or permitting the use of trademarks, trade names or other designations of CDDB in a manner other than that specified in the Agreement or in any trademark

use guidelines issued by Gracenote; and (k) by causing its Licensed Application to access the CDDB Server to obtain data and/or send data to the CDDB Server in a manner other than direct access, by causing such Licensed Application to first access other sites and/or IP addresses (other than an End-User's internal network's proxy server) during access to the CDDB Server, by redirecting queries of the CDDB Server to MusicMatch's own site and/or other servers and by otherwise interfering with operation of the CDDB client.

- 89. Upon information and belief, in and among other breaches, MusicMatch has unjustifiably and inexcusably breached its obligations under the Agreement by failing to discontinue duplication of CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications by March 31, 2002 and/or failing to use commercially reasonable efforts to have its OEM customers discontinue duplication of CDDB²-Enabled licensed applications by March 31, 2002.
- 90. MusicMatch's breaches of the Agreement cause Gracenote immediate and irreparable harm and entitle Gracenote to injunctive relief.
- 91. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch has intentionally and in bad faith violated express restrictions on use of CDDB Data and End User Data in the Agreement, entitling Gracenote to seek recovery of lost profits, lost savings or other incidental, consequential, punitive, special, or exemplary damages in amounts in excess of amounts paid or due to Gracenote under the Agreement.
- 92. As a direct and proximate result of MusicMatch's breach, Gracenote has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF <u>UNFAIR COMPETITION (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200)</u>

- 93. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 94. The acts described above constitute unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq., which prohibits acts of unfair competition, including any and all "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice," and 2) in violation

of the common law of the State of California in that MusicMatch has obtained an unfair competitive advantage over Gracenote in the market because it has wrongfully relied upon and enabled applications containing and/or using Gracenote's proprietary information.

- 95. As a direct and proximate cause of MusicMatch's intentional misappropriation and misuse of Gracenote's proprietary information, MusicMatch's trademark infringement and MusicMatch's interference with Gracenote's economic relations, MusicMatch has been unjustly enriched and Gracenote has sustained damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Gracenote has also suffered irreparable harm as a result of MusicMatch's conduct and will continue to suffer irreparable injury that cannot be adequately remedied at law unless MusicMatch, and its officers, agents and employees, and all other persons acting in concert with them, are enjoined from engaging in any further such acts of unfair competition.
- 96. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch's acts and conduct which resulted in the unfair competition were carried out willfully, fraudulently, maliciously and with wanton disregard of Gracenote's rights, thereby entitling Gracenote to punitive damages to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF <u>UNFAIR COMPETITION (California Common Law)</u>

- 97. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 98. The acts described above constitute unfair competition in violation of the common law of the State of California in that MusicMatch has obtained an unfair competitive advantage over Gracenote in the market because it has wrongfully relied upon and enabled applications containing and/or using Gracenote's proprietary information.
- 99. Gracenote invested substantial time, skill and money in developing its technology and its proprietary information. Gracenote is informed and believes that MusicMatch has appropriated and used Gracenote's proprietary information at little or no cost to MusicMatch and without the authorization or consent of Gracenote.
 - 100. As a direct and proximate cause of MusicMatch's intentional misappropriation and

misuse of Gracenote's proprietary information, MusicMatch's trademark infringement and MusicMatch's interference with Gracenote's economic relations, MusicMatch has been unjustly enriched and Gracenote has sustained damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Gracenote has also suffered irreparable harm as a result of MusicMatch's conduct and will continue to suffer irreparable injury that cannot be adequately remedied at law unless MusicMatch, and its officers, agents and employees, and all other persons acting in concert with them, are enjoined from engaging in any further such acts of unfair competition.

101. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch's acts and conduct which resulted in the unfair competition were carried out willfully, fraudulently, maliciously and with wanton disregard of Gracenote's rights, thereby entitling Gracenote to punitive damages to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

- 102. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 103. MusicMatch's acts described above constitute trademark infringement of the CDDB word mark, in violation of section 32(l) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).
- 104. MusicMatch's wrongful acts have permitted or will permit it to make substantial sales and profits on the strength of Gracenote's nationwide advertising, sales, consumer recognition and goodwill in connection with the CDDB word mark.
- 105. MusicMatch either had actual notice and knowledge, or had constructive notice, of Gracenote's ownership and registration in the United States of the CDDB word mark pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1072 prior to the commencement of MusicMatch's sale of products and services under the CDDB word mark. Gracenote has requested that MusicMatch cease and desist from its acts of infringement and has given MusicMatch notice of Gracenote's registration of the CDDB word mark, but MusicMatch has not indicated to Gracenote that it has ceased such acts.
- 106. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch deliberately and willfully used the CDDB word mark in connection with its sale of products and services, in an attempt to trade on -23- FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

the goodwill, reputation and selling power established by Gracenote under the CDDB word mark.

- 107. MusicMatch's unauthorized use of the CDDB word mark falsely indicates to consumers that MusicMatch's products or services are in some manner connected with, sponsored by, affiliated with, or related to Gracenote's goods and services.
- 108. MusicMatch's unauthorized use of the CDDB word mark also causes consumers to be confused as to the source, nature and quality of the goods and services that MusicMatch is promoting, distributing and selling.
- 109. MusicMatch's unauthorized use of the CDDB work mark in connection with its products and services deprives Gracenote of the ability to control the consumer perception of the quality of goods and services marketed under the CDDB word mark.
- 110. The aforementioned activities of MusicMatch are likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive consumers or potential consumers willing to purchase CDDB's services.
- 111. As a direct and proximate result of MusicMatch's wrongful, willful conduct, Gracenote, among other things, has been and will be deprived of the value of its federally registered CDDB word mark as a commercial asset.
- 112. Gracenote has no adequate remedy at law for MusicMatch's continuing violation of Gracenote's rights and has been, is now, and will be irreparably injured and damaged by MusicMatch's trademark infringement. MusicMatch's wrongful acts will continue to damage Gracenote unless the Court enjoins MusicMatch's acts.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

INTENTIONAL INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

- 113. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 114. MusicMatch knew of the economic relationships between Gracenote and other developers that offer Gracenote-enabled applications, which contain a probable future economic benefit to Gracenote.

	115.	MusicMatch knew of the economic relationships between Gracenote and end-users
of other Gracenote-enabled applications, which contain a probable future economic benefit to		
Grace	note.	

- 116. MusicMatch has intentionally offered and offers applications designed to interfere with and which actually interfere with end-user registrations of other Gracenote-enabled applications installed on an end-user computer. MusicMatch's applications cause such interference by, among other things, overwriting or deleting registrations of other Gracenote-enabled products on the end-user computer and causing other Gracenote-enabled applications on the end-user computer to re-register with a new user ID.
- 117. By means of this behavior of MusicMatch's products, MusicMatch has intentionally and wrongfully interfered with or disrupted Gracenote's economic relationships with developers by causing such developers to be billed more than once per end-user of the developer's Gracenote-enabled application.
- 118. By means of this behavior of MusicMatch's products, MusicMatch has intentionally and wrongfully interfered with or disrupted Gracenote's economic relationships with end-users of Gracenote-enabled applications by causing such end-users to re-register for use of such other application and/or register for use of Gracenote's services and to be confused as to the cause of such required re-registration.
- 119. As a result of MusicMatch's interference, Gracenote has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial. This harm would not occur but for the interference of MusicMatch's product.
- 120. MusicMatch carried out the acts and conduct which caused the breach willfully, fraudulently, maliciously, and with wanton disregard of Gracenote's rights, thereby entitling Gracenote to punitive damages to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

NEGLIGENT INTERFERENCE WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

121. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 – 81 above as if set forth in full

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

ORRICK

28 HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

herein.

- 122. MusicMatch knew of the economic relationships between Gracenote and other developers which offer Gracenote-enabled applications, which contain a probable future economic benefit to Gracenote.
- 123. MusicMatch knew of the economic relationships between Gracenote and end-users of other Gracenote-enabled applications, which contain a probable future economic benefit to Gracenote.
- 124. MusicMatch has offered and offers applications that actually interfere with enduser registrations of other Gracenote-enabled applications installed on an end-user computer. MusicMatch's applications cause such interference by, among other things, overwriting or deleting registrations of other Gracenote-enabled products on the end-user computer and causing other Gracenote-enabled applications on the end-user computer to re-register with a new user ID.
- 125. By means of this behavior of MusicMatch's products, MusicMatch has negligently interfered with or disrupted Gracenote's economic relationships with developers by causing such developers to be billed more than once per end-user of the developer's Gracenote-enabled application.
- 126. By means of this behavior of MusicMatch's products, MusicMatch has negligently interfered with or disrupted Gracenote's economic relationships with end-users of Gracenoteenabled applications by causing such end-users to re-register for use of such other application and/or register for use of Gracenote's services and to be confused as to the cause of such required re-registration.
- 127. MusicMatch was aware or should have been aware that if it did not act with due care its actions would interfere with Gracenote's relationships with its developers and end-users and cause Gracenote to lose in whole or in part the probable future economic benefit or advantage of the relationship.
- MusicMatch was negligent and failed to exercise due care in offering its interfering products.

- 129. As a result of MusicMatch's negligent interference, Gracenote's relationships with developers and end users have actually been interfered with or disrupted and Gracenote has lost in whole or in part the economic benefits or advantage from the relationship.
- 130. Thus, Gracenote has been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial. This harm would not occur but for the interference of MusicMatch's product.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '192 PATENT

- 131. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 132. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch has used apparatus and performed methods through its music and content delivery system that directly infringe one or more claims of the '192 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).
- 133. Upon information and belief, and by virtue of MusicMatch's acts as set forth above, MusicMatch has made, used, offered to sell and sold its music and content delivery system in the United States, thus infringing one or more claims of the '192 patent.
- 134. MusicMatch has therefore induced, and is actively inducing, various third parties to infringe claims of the '192 patent by encouraging use of its music and content delivery system in the United States. Thus, MusicMatch is liable to Gracenote under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).
- 135. Upon information and belief and, by virtue of MusicMatch's acts as set forth above, MusicMatch has made, used, offered to sell and sold its music and content delivery system in the United States, which has contributed to the infringement of one or more claims of the '192 patent.
- 136. MusicMatch's music and content delivery system constitutes a material part of the invention covered under the '192 patent. MusicMatch knows that its music and content delivery system are especially made and adapted for use in infringement of such patent, and that it is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing uses. Thus, MusicMatch is liable to Gracenote for contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

	137.	MusicMatch's acts of direct, contributor	y and inducement of infring	ement have
been v	with full	and complete knowledge of Gracenote's	intellectual property rights.	Accordingly,
Music	Match's	conduct and activities have been, and wi	ll continue to be willful, del	iberate and in
total d	lisregard	of Gracenote's rights in the '192 patent.	Thus, this case should be co	onsidered
"exce	ptional"	pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.		

138. MusicMatch's foregoing conduct has left Gracenote with no adequate remedy at law and has caused, is causing, and if not enjoined will continue to cause irreparable damage to Gracenote.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF INFRINGEMENT OF THE '593 PATENT

- 139. Gracenote incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-81 above as if set forth in full herein.
- 140. Upon information and belief, MusicMatch has used apparatus and performed methods through its music and content delivery system that directly infringe one or more claims of the '593 patent under 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).
- 141. Upon information and belief, and by virtue of MusicMatch's acts as set forth above, MusicMatch has made, used, offered to sell and sold its music and content delivery system in the United States, thus infringing one or more claims of the '593 patent.
- 142. MusicMatch has therefore induced, and is actively inducing, various third parties to infringe claims of the '593 patent by encouraging use of its music and content delivery system in the United States. Thus, MusicMatch is liable to Gracenote under 35 U.S.C. § 271(b).
- 143. Upon information and belief and, by virtue of MusicMatch's acts as set forth above, MusicMatch has made, used, offered to sell and sold its music and content delivery system in the United States, which has contributed to the infringement of one or more claims of the '593 patent.
- 144. MusicMatch's music and content delivery system constitutes a material part of the invention covered under the '593 patent. MusicMatch knows that its music and content delivery

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
20

ORRICK

HERRINGTON
SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY

system are especially made and adapted for use in infringement of such patent, and that it is not a staple article or commodity of commerce suitable for substantial noninfringing uses. Thus, MusicMatch is liable to Gracenote for contributory infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 271(c).

- 145. MusicMatch's acts of direct, contributory and inducement of infringement have been with full and complete knowledge of Gracenote's intellectual property rights. Accordingly, MusicMatch's conduct and activities have been, and will continue to be willful, deliberate and in total disregard of Gracenote's rights in the '593 patent. Thus, this case should be considered "exceptional" pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285.
- 146. MusicMatch's foregoing conduct has left Gracenote with no adequate remedy at law and has caused, is causing, and if not enjoined will continue to cause irreparable damage to Gracenote.

WHEREFORE, Gracenote seeks relief as hereinafter set forth.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Gracenote prays for the following relief:

- A. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for breach of contract;
- B. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for intentional and bad faith violation of the express restrictions on use of CDDB Data and End User Data in the Agreement between Gracenote and MusicMatch;
 - C. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for unfair competition;
- D. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for negligent or intentional interference with prospective economic advantage;
- E. Entry of a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant

 MusicMatch, together with its officers, agents, employees and attorneys, and upon those persons
 in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice of the Order from using any
 proprietary information of Gracenote;
- F. Entry of a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant

 MusicMatch, together with its officers, agents, employees and attorneys, and upon those persons
 in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice of the Order from breaching

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

ORRICK HERRINGTON SUTCLIFFE LLP terms of the Agreement between Gracenote and MusicMatch;

- An order compelling Defendant MusicMatch to specifically perform its obligations G. under the Agreement between Gracenote and MusicMatch;
- H. Entry of a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant MusicMatch, together with its officers, agents, employees and attorneys, and upon those persons in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice of the Order from engaging in the conduct constituting negligent or intentional interference with prospective economic advantage;
- I. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for direct infringement, inducing infringement and contributory infringement of the '192 and '593 patents;
- J. Entry of a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant MusicMatch, together with its officers, agents, employees and attorneys, and upon those persons in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice of the Order from directly, inducing or contributorily infringing the claims of the two patents at issue herein;
- K. An Order adjudging Defendant MusicMatch to be liable for trademark infringement;
- L. Entry of a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendant MusicMatch, together with its officers, agents, employees and attorneys, and upon those persons in active concert or participation with it who receive actual notice of the Order from infringing Gracenote's trademarks at issue herein;
- An award of compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial resulting M. from the conduct complained of herein, including an award of compensatory damages suffered by Gracenote as a direct and proximate cause of MusicMatch's breach of the Agreement, an award of compensatory and trebled damages as permitted under 35 U.S.C. § 284 for MusicMatch's willful acts of patent infringement, an award of profits made by MusicMatch and the actual damages suffered by Gracenote as a result of MusicMatch's trademark infringement, an award of treble damages and enhanced profits pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a) for MusicMatch's

1	trademark inf	ringement; together with interest and costs;
2	N.	Punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
3	O.	Reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses and costs as the prevailing party in this
4	action, includ	ling a declaration that this case is "exceptional" under 35 U.S.C. § 285; and
5	P.	Such other relief as this Court deems necessary and just.
6		
7	Dated: Augu	st 21, 2002.
8		Respectfully submitted,
9		ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
10		1/-1/-1
11		William Sloan Coats
12		Vickie L. Feeman Gabriel M. Ramsey
13		Attorneys for Plaintiff Gracenote, Inc.
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25	!	
25 26		
26 27		
٠′		

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY

<u>DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTED PARTIES OR ENTITIES</u> <u>PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER NO. 48</u>

Pursuant to General Order No. 48, the undersigned certifies that as of this date there is no such interest to report.

Dated: August 21, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

William Sloan Coats
Vickie L. Feeman
Gabriel M. Ramsey
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Gracenote, Inc.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Gracenote, Inc., hereby demands a jury trial in this action.

Dated: August 21, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

William Sloan Coats

Vickie L. Feeman Gabriel M. Ramsey Attorneys for Plaintiff

Gracenote, Inc.

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

ORRICK
HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
SILICON VALLEY