

1 Sarah E. Fowler (SBN CA 264838)
SFowler@perkinscoie.com
2 PERKINS COIE LLP
3150 Porter Drive
3 Palo Alto, California 94304-1212
Telephone: 650.838.4300
4 Facsimile: 650.838.4350

5 Gene W. Lee (*pro hac vice*)
GLee@perkinscoie.com
6 Thomas V. Matthew (*pro hac vice*)
TMatthew@perkinscoie.com
7 PERKINS COIE LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas, 22nd Floor
8 New York, New York 10036-2711
Telephone: 212.262.6900
9 Facsimile: 212.977.1649

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Twitter, Inc.*

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
14

15 TWITTER, INC.,
16 Plaintiff,
17 v.
18 VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.,
19 Defendant.

Case No. 21-CV-09773-JD
**TWITTER’S OPPOSITION TO
VOIP-PAL’S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Honorable James Donato
Date: TBD
Time: TBD
Courtroom 11, 19th floor

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1			
2			Page(s)
3	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
4	II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
5		A. VoIP-Pal’s 2016 And 2018 Cases And The RBR Patents.....	2
6		B. VoIP-Pal’s 2020 Texas Cases And Press Release, And Twitter’s, Apple’s, AT&T’s, And Verizon’s 2020 DJ Actions.....	3
7		C. Twitter’s 2021 DJ Action For The ’872 Patent	5
8		D. The Texas Mobile Gateway Cases	6
9		E. Second Settlement Conference In Twitter’s 2020 DJ Action And Twitter’s Filing Of The Present Action.....	6
10			
11	III.	ARGUMENT	7
12		A. Subject Matter Jurisdiction Exists For Twitter’s Declaratory Judgment Claim.....	7
13		1. Subject Matter Jurisdiction Is Analyzed Under The Totality Of The Circumstances.....	7
14		1. All The Circumstances Show The Existence Of A Sufficiently Justiciable Controversy.....	8
15		2. VoIP-Pal Misapplies The <i>Cepheid</i> Decision	10
16			
17		B. This Court Has Personal Jurisdiction Over VoIP-Pal	11
18		1. Legal Standard For Personal Jurisdiction.....	11
19		2. VoIP-Pal Has Purposefully Directed Its Activities At Residents Of This Forum And Twitter’s Claims Arise Out Of And Relate To Those Activities.....	12
20			
21		3. Personal Jurisdiction Over VoIP-Pal Is Reasonable And Fair	14
22		C. Venue Is Proper In This District.....	15
23	IV.	CONCLUSION	15
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE(S)
CASES	
<i>Acorda Therapeutics Inc. v. Mylan Pharms. Inc.</i> , 817 F.3d 755 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	14
<i>ActiveVideo Networks, Inc. v. TransVideo Elecs., Ltd.</i> , 975 F. Supp. 2d 1083 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	11, 12, 14
<i>Akro Corp. v. Luker</i> , 45 F.3d 1541 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	11
<i>Arkema Inc. v. Honeywell Int’l, Inc.</i> , 706 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	8, 9, 11, 12
<i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. U.S. Pat. & Trademark Off.</i> , 689 F.3d 1303 (Fed. Cir. 2012), <i>rev’d in part on other grounds by Ass’n for</i> <i>Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.</i> , 569 U.S. 576 (2013)	7
<i>Avocent Huntsville Corp. v. Aten Int’l Co.</i> , 552 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11
<i>Bailey v. Household Fin. Corp. of Cal.</i> , No. 10cv857, 2010 WL 4569950 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2010).....	13
<i>Breckenridge Pharm., Inc. v. Metabolite Lab’ys., Inc.</i> , 444 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	14, 15
<i>Burger King Corporation v. Rudewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462 (1985).....	14
<i>Cepheid v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.</i> , No. C-12-4411, 2013 WL 184125 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2013).....	10, 11
<i>Coinbase, Inc. v. Modern Font Applications LLC</i> , Case No. 21-cv-05405, 2022 WL 62913 (N.D. Cal Jan. 6, 2022)	13
<i>Danisco U.S. Inc. v. Novozymes A/S</i> , 744 F.3d 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	8, 9
<i>Dow Chem. Co. v. Calderon</i> , 422 F.3d 827 (9th Cir. 2005).....	13
<i>Elecs. for Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle</i> , 340 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	13, 14, 15

	Page(s)
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)	
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	
28	

<i>Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall,</i> 466 U.S. 408 (1984).....	11
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Acceleron LLC,</i> 587 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	7
<i>Inamed Corp. v. Kuzmak,</i> 249 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	11
<i>Int'l Shoe Co. v. Wash., Off. of Unemployment Comp.,</i> 326 U.S. 310 (1945).....	11
<i>Juniper Networks, Inc. v. Swarm Tech. LLC,</i> Case No. 20-cv-03137, 2021 WL 6049924 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2021).....	13
<i>Klinghoffer v. S.N.C. Achille Lauro Ed Altri-Gestione Motonave Achille Lauro in</i> <i>Amministrazione Straordinaria,</i> 937 F.2d 44 (2d Cir. 1991).....	13
<i>Lyft, Inc. v. Quartz Auto Techs. LLC,</i> Case No. 21-cv-01871, 2021 WL 6618867 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2021)	14
<i>Mavrix Photo, Inc. v. Brand Techs., Inc.,</i> 647 F.3d 1218 (9th Cir. 2011).....	11
<i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.,</i> 549 U.S. 118 (2007).....	7
<i>Milliken v. Meyer,</i> 311 U.S. 457 (1940).....	11
<i>Monolithic Power Sys. v. O2 Micro Int'l, Ltd.,</i> No. C 07-2363, 2007 WL 2318924 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2007).....	10
<i>Neuralstem, Inc. v. StemCells, Inc.,</i> 573 F. Supp. 2d 888 (D. Md. 2008)	12, 13
<i>Torrent Pharms. Ltd. v. Daiichi Sankyo, Inc.,</i> 196 F. Supp. 3d 871, 876–77 (N.D. Ill. 2016)	13
<i>Trimble Inc. v. PerDiemCo LLC,</i> No. 19-2164 (Fed. Cir. May 12, 2021), ECF No. 78	14
<i>U.S. Aluminum Corp. v. Kawneer Co.,</i> 694 F.2d 193 (9th Cir. 1982).....	15

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
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

Page(s)

Viam Corp. v. Iowa Exp.-Imp. Trading Co.,
84 F.3d 424 (Fed. Cir. 1996)14, 15

Xilinx, Inc. v. Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG,
848 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2017)14, 15

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 139115

35 U.S.C. § 1012, 4

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Rule 3-12(a)10

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.