

1 Adron W. Beene SB# 129040
2 Adron G. Beene SB# 298088
3 Attorney at Law
4 1754 Technology Drive, Suite 228
5 San Jose, CA 95110
6 Tel: (408) 392-9233
7 Fax: (866) 329-0453
8 adron@adronlaw.com

9 Attorneys for Defendants:
10 PURETHINK LLC, a Delaware limited
11 liability company, IGOV INC., a Virginia
12 corporation, and JOHN MARK SUHY

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 NEO4J, INC., a Delaware corporation,
17 and NEO4J SWEDEN AB, a Swedish
18 corporation,

19 Plaintiffs

20 v.

21 PURETHINK LLC, a Delaware limited
22 liability company, IGOV INC., a
23 Virginia corporation, and JOHN MARK
24 SUHY, an individual,
25 Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:18-cv-7182 EJD

**DEFENDANT JOHN MARK
SUHY'S ANSWER TO
PLAINTIFFS' FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendant JOHN MARK SUHY, an individual ("Defendant") answers

NEO4J, INC. ("Neo4J USA") and NEO4J SWEDEN AB's ("Neo4J Sweden")

First Amended Complaint as follows:

- 1 1. Defendant admits the statement outlines the claims but otherwise
2 denies the claims and allegations in paragraph 1.
- 3 2. Defendant admits the first and second sentence in paragraph 2.
4 Defendant' deny that plaintiff is the graph company behind an open
5 source software product called Neo4J as the software is owned by and
6 licensed by Neo4J Sweden AB according to the license for Neo4J-
7 enterprise available at GitHub. Defendant lacks knowledge or
8 information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining
9 allegations and on that basis denies the remaining allegations.
- 10 3. Defendant denies the allegation in paragraph 3. Defendant believes
11 that many users are using the open source version called Neo4J and
12 not what plaintiff calls Neo4J®. This confusion arises because plaintiff
13 Neo4J, USA claims they own Neo4J software yet the open source
14 license is by Neo4J Sweden. Likewise, there appear over 100
15 contributors to the open source version of the Neo4J software and
16 Defendant do not know if each contributor has assigned contributions
17 to either plaintiff. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient
18 to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations and on
19 that basis denies the remaining allegations.
- 20 4. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
21 about the truth of the allegations and on that basis denies the
22 allegations.
- 23 5. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 5 except it denies
24 PureThink is a shell entity maintained by the other Defendant and is
25

1 not currently conducting or engaged in any meaningful business
2 activities.

3 6. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 6 except it denies iGov
4 is the assignee and successor-in-interest to PureThink or otherwise
5 acquired substantially all of PureThink's assets sometime in mid-2017
6 and deny that Neo4J is a large scale graph solution as it is limited in
7 scalability.

8 7. Defendant admits that iGov does business as GraphStack, but denies
9 the remaining allegations in paragraph 7.

10 8. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 8 except for the fact
11 Suhy is an individual and the last sentence.

12 9. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 9.

13 10. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 10.

14 11. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 11 are an example
15 to support the allegations and deny Defendant share the same
16 customer support number but admit the facts alleged.

17 12. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 12 are an example
18 to support the allegations but admit the facts alleged except Defendant
19 lacks information or belief about what virtually identical means.

20 13. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 13 as the verb
21 ported is unclear and vague.

22 14. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 14.

23 15. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 15.

24 16. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 16.

25 17. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 17.

1 18. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 18.

2 19. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 19.

3 20. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 20.

4 21. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
5 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 21 and on that
6 basis denies the allegations.

7 22. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
8 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 22 and on that
9 basis denies the allegations.

10 23. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
11 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 23 and on that
12 basis denies the allegations.

13 24. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
14 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 24 and on that
15 basis denies the allegations. Defendant is informed and believes that
16 both plaintiffs did not license the open source version of Neo4J software
17 as the open source licenses state the software is owned and license by
18 Neo4J Sweden.

19 25. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
20 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 25 and on that
21 basis denies the allegations. Defendant is informed and believes that
22 both plaintiffs did not license the open source version of Neo4J software
23 as the open source licenses state the software is owned and license by
24 Neo4J Sweden. Further, Neo4J Sweden did not license a commercial
25 product based on the open source software.

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. Defendant deny the allegations in paragraph 26.
- 27. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 27.
- 28. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 28.
- 29. Defendant denies it agreed to provide first and second line support to end-users of NEO4J® EE software. Defendant admits the remaining allegations paragraph 29.
- 30. Defendant admits the first sentence in paragraph 30 and denies the remainder.
- 31. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 31 and on that basis denies the allegations.
- 32. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 32.
- 33. Defendant admits the first sentence in paragraph 33 and denies the remainder.
- 34. Defendant admits the allegations paragraph 34.
- 35. Defendant admits the allegations paragraph 35.
- 36. Defendant admits the allegations paragraph 36.
- 37. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 37.
- 38. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 38.
- 39. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 39.
- 40. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 40.
- 41. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 41.
- 42. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 42.
- 43. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 43.

- 1 44. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 44.
- 2 45. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 45.
- 3 46. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 46.
- 4 47. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 47.
- 5 48. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 48.
- 6 49. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 49.
- 7 50. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 50.
- 8 51. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 51.
- 9 52. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 52.
- 10 53. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 53.
- 11 54. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 54.
- 12 55. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 55.
- 13 56. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 56.
- 14 57. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 57.
- 15 58. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 58.
- 16 59. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 59.
- 17 60. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 60.
- 18 61. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 61.
- 19 62. Defendant admits to posting messages on Twitter. Defendant
20 denies that he spread misinformation, unfairly competed, and the
21 remaining allegations in paragraph 62.
- 22 63. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 63.
- 23 64. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 64.
- 24 65. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 65.
- 25 66. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 66.

1 67. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 67.

2 68. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a
3 belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 68 and on that
4 basis denies the allegations. Neo4J Sweden's copyright management
5 information violates the APGL copyright.

6 69. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 69 and such
7 removal was to prevent further violation of the AGPL license and
8 removal of infringing material is expressly allowed under the AGPL.

9 70. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 70.

10 71. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 71 to the extent
11 Suhy stated in an email he had recorded him, otherwise denied. The
12 statement was to avoid the changes of instructions on the employees
13 part. Suhy felt if the employee thought his calls were being recorded, he
14 would temper his fluxuations and false changes in instructions.

15 72. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 72 to the extent
16 Suhy stated in an email he had recorded him, otherwise denied. The
17 statement was to avoid the changes of instructions on the employees
18 part. Suhy felt if the employee thought his calls were being recorded, he
19 would temper his fluxuations and false changes in instructions.

20 73. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 73 to the extent
21 Suhy told him he had recorded phone calls, otherwise denied. The
22 statement was to avoid the changes of instructions on the employees
23 part. Suhy felt if the employee thought his calls were being recorded, he
24 would temper his fluxuations and false changes in instructions.

25 74. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-73.

1 75. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 75. Neo4J USA
2 did not exist in 2007. It was formed in 2011. The software has been
3 licensed on an open source basis by Neo4J Sweden and called Neo4J by
4 Neo4J Sweden. The ownership of the Neo4J software is claimed by
5 Neo4J Sweden. Likewise, the software development was provided by
6 over 100 contributors, Github shows that there are 1,515 forks to the
7 software with 22 branches and Defendant do not know if the
8 contributors have assigned the rights to the Neo4J open source
9 software copyright to either plaintiff.

10 76. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 76. Neo4J USA
11 did not exist in 2007. It was formed in 2011. The software has been
12 licensed on an open source basis by Neo4J Sweden and called Neo4J by
13 Neo4J Sweden. The ownership of the Neo4J software is claimed by
14 Neo4J Sweden. Likewise, the software development was provided by
15 over 100 contributors, Github shows that there are 1,515 forks to the
16 software with 22 branches and Defendant do not know if the
17 contributors have assigned the rights to the Neo4J open source
18 software copyright to either plaintiff.

19 77. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 77. The software
20 has been licensed on an open source basis by Neo4J Sweden and called
21 Neo4J by Neo4J Sweden. The ownership of the Neo4J software is
22 claimed by Neo4J Sweden AB. Likewise, software development was
23 provided by over 100 contributors, Github shows that there are 1,515
24 forks to the software with 22 branches and Defendant do not know if
25

1 the contributors have assigned the rights to the Neo4J open source
2 software copyright to plaintiff.

3 78. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 78. The software
4 has been licensed on an open source basis by Neo4J Sweden AB and
5 called Neo4J by Neo4J Sweden AB and ownership of the software is
6 claimed by Neo4J Sweden AB. Likewise, software development was
7 provided by over 100 contributors, Github shows that there are 1,515
8 forks to the software with 22 branches and Defendant do not know if
9 the contributors have assigned the rights to the Neo4J open source
10 software copyright to plaintiff. Defendant denies that goodwill in the
11 name Neo4J is exclusively held by Neo4J USA.

12 79. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 79.

13 80. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 80.

14 81. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 81.

15 82. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 82.

16 83. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 83.

17 84. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 84.

18 85. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 85.

19 86. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 86.

20 87. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-86.

21 88. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 88.

22 89. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 89.

23 90. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 90.

24 91. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 91.

25 92. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 92.

- 1 93. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 93.
- 2 94. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 94.
- 3 95. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-94.
- 4 96. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 96.
- 5 97. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 97.
- 6 98. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 98.
- 7 99. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 99.
- 8 100. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 100.
- 9 101. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 101.
- 10 102. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-101.
- 11 103. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 103.
- 12 104. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 104.
- 13 105. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 105.
- 14 106. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 106.
- 15 107. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 107.
- 16 108. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-107.
- 17 109. Defendant admits Purethink it signed the Partner Agreement
18 but Defendant otherwise deny the allegations in paragraph 83, because
19 plaintiff has failed to perform, clauses 4.3.1, and 4.3.2 are not
20 enforceable as written or applied and the limitations in the Partner
21 Agreement violate the open source Neo4J enterprise license.
- 22 110. Defendant admits the allegations in paragraph 110.
- 23 111. Defendant admits the terms of the 7.3 of the Partner Agreement
24 claims to prevent PureThink from dealing in Products which is defined
25 as Neo4J commercial software provided by Neo Technology and

1 licensed to the End User but otherwise denies the allegations in
2 paragraph 111.

3 112. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 112.

4 113. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 113.

5 114. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 114.

6 115. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 115.

7 116. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 116.

8 117. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 117.

9 118. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 118.

10 119. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 119.

11 120. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 120.

12 121. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-120.

13 122. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 122.

14 123. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 123.

15 124. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 124.

16 125. Defendant admits the first and second sentence in paragraph 125
17 and denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 125.

18 126. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 126.

19 127. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 127.

20 128. Defendant admits Neo4J USA seeks statutory damages but deny
21 they are entitled to any damages as alleged in paragraph 128.

22 129. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 129.

23 130. Defendant incorporate its responses to paragraphs 1-129.

24 131. Defendant lack sufficient information and belief to answer
25 pararagraph 131 and on said basis denies. Neo4J Sweden states it

owns the open source version of Neo4J but the software was also created by over 100 contributors who are also copyright holders.

132. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 132.

133. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 133.

134. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 134.

135. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 135.

136. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 136.

137. Except as otherwise admitted, Defendant denies the allegations in the FAC.

Affirmative Defenses

1. Void Restriction

Section 4.3.2 of the Partner Agreement, provides:

During the term of this Agreement and up until thirty six (36) months after the termination or expiration of this Agreement, Partner may not develop, market, distribute or offer any services related to any Neo Technology Community Edition Products, derivative works of such products, or any Partner software code made to work with Neo Technology Community Edition Products(including, without limitation, hosting services, training, technical support, configuration and customization services, etc.)

Neo4J USA seeks to prevent Defendant from licensing and supporting open source software during and for 36 months after termination of the Partner Agreement. The Partner Agreement is, by its terms, governed by California law. The restriction under Section 4.3.2 cannot be enforced against Defendant as it is void under California Business and Professions Code §16600: “Except as provided in this chapter, every

1 contract by which anyone is restrained from engaging in a lawful
2 profession, trade, or business of any kind is to that extent void.”
3

4 **2. License To Use Neo4J Open Source Software**

5 Section 4.3.1 of the Partner Agreement provides:

6 **4.3.1** During the term of this Agreement, Partner may not use or run
7 on any of Partner’s hardware, or have deployed for internal use, any
8 Neo Technology Community Edition Products for commercial or
9 production use. In no event shall Partner reverse engineer, distribute
10 or otherwise use the Products for its own internal use. There are no
11 implied rights. Partner will not fork or bifurcate the source code for any
12 Neo Technology Community Edition Products into a separately
13 maintained source code repository so that development done on the
14 original code requires manual work to be transferred to the forked
15 software or so that the forked software starts to have features not
16 present in the original software.

17 The restrictions in Paragraphs 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 violate the GNU
18 AFFERO GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSED VERSION 3 for Neo4J
19 enterprise software:
20

21 Section 2 (Basic Permissions) of the AGPL license provides, in part:

22 “All rights granted under this License are granted for the term of
23 copyright on the Program, and are irrevocable provided the stated
24 conditions are met. This License explicitly affirms your unlimited
25 permission to run the unmodified Program. ...

You may make, run and propagate covered works that you do not
convey, without conditions so long as your license otherwise
remains in force. You may convey covered works to others for the
sole purpose of having them make modifications exclusively for
you, or provide you with facilities for running those works,
provided that you comply with the terms of this License in
conveying all material for which you do not control copyright.”

Section 4 of the AGPL license provides, in part:

“You may charge any price or no price for each copy that you
convey, and you may offer support or warranty protection for a
fee.”

1 Section 10 (Automatic licensing of Downstream Recipients)

2 of the AGPL provides, in part:

3 “You may not impose any further restrictions on the exercise of the
4 rights granted or affirmed under this License.”

5 Defendant are licensed to use the open source software version of
6 Neo4J by Neo4J Sweden AB without restriction under the AGPL
7 license agreement. Neo4J USA may not impose restrictions on use of
8 Neo4J and cannot prevent or bar Defendant from using the open source
9 Neo4J. By imposing restrictions in violation of the License, plaintiff has
10 breached the open source license and has no rights to use or license
11 Neo4J.

12
13 **3. Right to fork and use Neo4J open source under GitHub Terms
14 of Service**

15 By using a public repository at GitHub, the open source versions of
16 Neo4J are subject to the GitHub Terms of Service which allow any
17 user to use and fork the software:

18
19 D. 5. If you set your pages and repositories to be viewed publicly,
20 you grant each User of GitHub a nonexclusive, worldwide license
21 to use, display, and perform Your Content through the GitHub
22 Service and to reproduce Your Content solely on GitHub as
23 permitted through GitHub's functionality (for example, through
24 forking). You may grant further rights if you [adopt a license](#). If
25 you are uploading Content you did not create or own, you are
responsible for ensuring that the Content you upload is licensed
under terms that grant these permissions to other GitHub Users.

<https://help.github.com/en/articles/github-terms-of-service>

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

4. **Unclean Hands**

Neo4J USA should not be permitted to enforce the Partner Agreement because of plaintiff's unclean hands in the use of the Partner Agreement. Neo4J USA told PureThink they could modify the scope of a license agreement to meet the needs of the government users such as the IRS. Neo4J USA's license model is priced for core processor charges. However, there is no per core charge on the open source version. Neo4J USA at first agreed PureThink could drop the core use pricing for the IRS, then later plaintiff refused to allow the price change. Neo4J USA also forbade its partners, such as PureThink, to discuss the available open source versions. When the IRS, faced with core pricing limitations, asked Purethink about the differences between the commercial software and the open source version of Neo4J, plaintiff told Purethink to lie stating the open source version could only be used on an open project to try to induce the IRS to purchase a commercial version of Neo4J. When plaintiff threatened to terminate PureThink, they agreed Purethink could remedy the breach if the IRS signed up for a commercial license through plaintiff. When the IRS wanted to use the Neo4J open source software with support from Purethink, plaintiff interfered falsely stating Purethink could not use or support Neo4J open source software. Neo4J USA is attempting to improperly use a dual licensing practice having a commercial version controlled by plaintiff and an open source software licensed

1 under a General Public License. Because the open source software is
2 under a GPL or AGPL license, and has over 100 contributors, plaintiff
3 may not be able to actually convert the GPL or AGPL license to
4 proprietary software. Under a GPL or AGPL type license, contributors'
5 efforts to modify the software cannot be taken away and turned into
6 privately controlled software. Defendant are informed and believe that
7 plaintiff only provides an object code version of the Neo4J software
8 under a commercial license while the GPL and AGPL type license
9 requires access to the source code as well. Defendant are informed and
10 believe that because plaintiff cannot lawfully operate a dual license
11 model since the open source is based on GPL or AGPL, plaintiff resorts
12 to sharp and false practices with customers (lying about the difference
13 between the commercial versions and the open source version)
14 attempting to restrict partners, such as PureThink, from supporting
15 the open source Neo4J version with unlawful restrictions and
16 interfering in attempts to use open source Neo4J software during the
17 partner term and for three years after termination. The rights of open
18 source users to use the software without making in open, as Neo4J
19 USA claim is shown by the FAQs at the GNU site:

20 If I only make copies of a GPL-covered program and run them, without
21 distributing or conveying them to others, what does the license require
of me? ([#NoDistributionRequirements](#))

22 Nothing. The GPL does not place any conditions on this activity.

23 The same rules apply to modified versions of the open source code:

24 Does the GPL require that source code of modified versions be posted to
25 the public? ([#GPLRequireSourcePostedPublic](#))

1 The GPL does not require you to release your modified version, or
2 any part of it. **You are free to make modifications and use**
3 **them privately, without ever releasing them. This applies to**
4 **organizations (including companies), too; an organization**
5 **can make a modified version and use it internally without**
6 **ever releasing it outside the organization.**

7 But *if* you release the modified version to the public in some way,
8 the GPL requires you to make the modified source code available to
9 the program's users, under the GPL.

10 Thus, the GPL gives permission to release the modified program in
11 certain ways, and not in other ways; but the decision of whether to
12 release it is up to you.

13 [Emphasis added]

14 As plaintiffs have sought to threaten open source users improperly,
15 they come to this court with unclean hands, they should be barred
16 from recovery.

17 5. The addition of the commons clause is unlawful under the 18 AGPL

19 The open source license used by Neo4J Sweden AB, the AGPL, is a
20 license copyrighted by the Free Software Foundation. The beginning of
21 the AGPL license provides a copyright notice:

22 Copyright (C) 2007 Free Software Foundation, Inc. <<http://fsf.org/>>
23 Everyone is permitted to copy and distribute verbatim copies
24 of this license document, but changing it is not allowed. [Emphasis
25 added]

By its terms, the license may not be changed.

Neo4J Sweden AB's attempt to change the AGPL license violates its
terms. The licensee is protected from this violation under the terms of
the license: "If the Program as you received it, or any part of it,
contains a notice stating that it is governed by this License along with

1 a term that is a further restriction, **you may remove that term.**
2 [Emphasis added]. §7 AGPL.

3 Defendant had the express right to remove any improper terms and
4 such removal prevented further infringement of the APGL license's
5 terms.

6 7 **6. NEO4J USA violated the AGPL**

8 Neo4J has attempted to take the open source software under the
9 AGPL and commercialize it in violation of the AGPL. "You may not
10 impose any further restrictions on the exercise of the rights granted or
11 affirmed under this License. For example, you may not impose a license
12 fee, royalty, or other charge for exercise of rights granted under this
13 License." §10 of the AGPL.

14 15 **7. Cancellation of Trademark Procured by Fraud**

16 The Registered Trademark for NEO4J, Reg. No. 4,784,280, was
17 procured by fraud as the representation was that Neo Technology (a
18 Delaware corporation) (changed to Neo4J, Inc.) first used the
19 trademark in 6-4-2006 and in commerce in 5-28-2007. These
20 statements are false as Neo Technology did not exist on those dates
21 represented as the company was formed 7-7-2011 in Delaware under
22 File Number 5007564. Because the registration was procured by fraud,
23 the registration should be cancelled pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1119.

24 25 **8. Fair Use of Trademarks**

1 Defendant use of the trademarks was and is a nominative fair use to 1)
2 identify a software product they support called Neo4J that is freely
3 available as open source software, 2) comparative advertising (See 16
4 C.F.R. §14.15(b)) and 3) to advise others PureThink was no longer a
5 partner with Neo4J USA.

6

7 **9. Naked License Abandonment of Trademark**

8 Neo4J USA claims they own the Neo4J trademark but there is
9 confusion whether that is a company name trademark or product name
10 trademark. This confusion is exacerbated by Neo4J Sweden's open
11 source license for the Neo4J software. Neo4J Sweden's license states:
12 "The software ("Software") is developed and owned by Neo4J Sweden
13 AB (referred to in this notice as "Neo4J")... . Neo4J Sweden asserts
14 they own the software-and not Neo4J USA- and yet both companies use
15 Neo4J name as part of the company name and call the open source
16 software product Neo4J too. As the Neo4J software is licensed as open
17 source software, there is no ability to maintain quality control of how
18 licensees modify, use or distributed or conveyed. As a result, Neo4J
19 USA has abandoned the Neo4J trademark under the doctrine of Naked
20 License.

21

22 **10. Waiver**

23 Neo4J USA waived Purethink's conduct in modifying the open source
24 version of Neo4J to create the government edition as they agreed
25

1 PureThink could use and modify the software as required to satisfy the
2 United States Government buyers.

3
4 **11. Setoff**

5 Neo4J USAs' alleged claims to damages are barred, in whole or in
6 part, by the right of one or more Defendant to a setoff against any such
7 damages.

8
9 **Prayer for Relief**

10 Wherefore Defendant request:

- 11 1. The complaint be dismissed with prejudice;
12 2. That the trademark based claims be found exceptional as the
13 trademark was obtain through fraud, the alleged infringements are
14 obviously nominative fair use and comparative advertising, allowing
15 Defendants to recover attorneys fees under 15 U.S.C. §1117 (a);
16 3. That Defendant recover costs;
17 4. And for such other relief as the Court deems just.

18 Dated: November 13, 2019

19 /s/ Adron G. Beene

20 Adron W. Beene SB# 129040
21 Adron G. Beene SB# 298088
22 Attorney At Law
23 1754 Technology Drive, Suite 228
24 San Jose, CA 95110
25 Tel: (408) 392-9233
Fax: (866) 329-0453
adron@adronlaw.com

Attorney for Defendant
PURETHINK LLC, a Delaware limited
liability company, IGOV INC., a Virginia
corporation, and JOHN MARK SUHY

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2
3 Defendant JOHN MARK SUHY hereby demands a trial by jury.

4
5 Dated: November 13, 2019

6 /s/ Adron G. Beene

7 Adron W. Beene SB# 129040
8 Adron G. Beene SB# 298088
9 Attorney At Law
10 1754 Technology Drive, Suite 228
11 San Jose, CA 95110
12 Tel: (408) 392-9233
13 Fax: (866) 329-0453
14 adron@adronlaw.com

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000