

Facts

1  
2           9. Plaintiff Mr. Margolin is the named inventor on numerous patents and patent  
3 applications, including United States Patent No. 5,566,073 ("the '073 Patent"), United States  
4 Patent No. 5,904,724 ("the '724 Patent"), United States Patent No. 5,978,488 ("the '488  
5 Patent") and United States Patent No. 6,377,436 ("the '436 Patent") (collectively "the Patents").

6           10. Mr. Margolin is the legal owner and owner of record for the '488 and '436  
7 Patents, and has never assigned those patents.

8           11. In July 2004, Mr. Margolin granted to Optima Technology Group ("OTG"), a  
9 Cayman Islands Corporation specializing in aerospace technology, a Power of Attorney  
10 regarding the '073 and '724 Patents. In exchange for the Power of Attorney, OTG agreed to  
11 pay Mr. Margolin royalties based on OTG's licensing of the '073 and '724 Patents.

12           12. In May 2006, OTG and Mr. Margolin licensed the '073 and '724 Patents to  
13 Geneva Aerospace, Inc., and Mr. Margolin received a royalty payment pursuant to the royalty  
14 agreement between Mr. Margolin and OTG.

15           13. On about July 20, 2004, Mr. Margolin assigned the '073 and '724 Patents to  
16 OTG.

17           14. In about November 2007, OTG licensed the '073 Patent to Honeywell  
18 International, Inc., and Mr. Margolin received a royalty payment pursuant to the royalty  
19 agreement between Mr. Margolin and OTG.

20           15. In December 2007, Defendant Zandian filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark  
21 Office ("USPTO") fraudulent assignment documents allegedly assigning all four of the Patents  
22 to Optima Technology Corporation.

23           16. Upon discovery of the fraudulent filing, Mr. Margolin: (a) filed a report with the  
24 Storey County Sheriff's Department; (b) took action to regain record title to the '488 and '436  
25 Patents that he legally owned; and (c) assisted OTG in regaining record title of the '073 and  
26 '724 Patents that it legally owned and upon which it contracted with Mr. Margolin for royalties.

27           17. Shortly before this, Mr. Margolin and OTG had been named as defendants in an  
28 action for declaratory relief regarding non-infringement of the '073 and '724 Patents in the

1 United States District Court for the District of Arizona, in a case titled: *Universal Avionics*  
2 *Systems Corporation v. Optima Technology Group, Inc.*, No. CV 07-588-TUC-RCC (the  
3 "Arizona Action"). In the Arizona Action, Mr. Margolin and OTG filed a cross-claim for  
4 declaratory relief against Optima Technology Corporation (Zandian) in order to obtain legal  
5 title to their respective patents.

6 18. On August 18, 2008, the United States District Court for the District of Arizona  
7 entered a final judgment in favor of Mr. Margolin and OTG on their declaratory relief action,  
8 and ordered that OTC—California and OTC—Nevada had no interest in the '073 or '724  
9 Patents, that the assignment documents filed by Zandian with the USPTO were "forged, invalid,  
10 void, of no force and effect," that the USPTO was to correct its records with respect to any  
11 claim by OTC to the Patents and/or the Power of Attorney, and that OTC was enjoined from  
12 asserting further rights or interests in the Patents and/or Power of Attorney. Attached as Exhibit  
13 A is a copy of the Order from the United States District Court in the Arizona Action.

14 19. Due to Defendants' fraudulent acts, title to the Patents was clouded and  
15 interfered with Plaintiff's and OTG's ability to license the Patents.

16 20. During the period of time Mr. Margolin worked to correct record title of the  
17 Patents in the Arizona Action and with the USPTO, he incurred significant litigation and other  
18 costs associated with those efforts.

19 **Claim 1--Conversion**  
20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 21. Paragraphs 1-20 of the Complaint set forth above are incorporated herein by  
22 reference.

23 22. Through the fraudulent acts described above, Defendants wrongfully exerted  
24 dominion over the Patents, thereby depriving Mr. Margolin of the use of such property.

25 23. The Patents and the royalties due Mr. Margolin under the Patents were the  
26 personal property of Mr. Margolin.

27 24. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conversion, Mr. Margolin  
28 has suffered damages in excess of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000), entitling him to the relief set