

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Miami Division
Case Number: 1:14-cv-20529-PAS

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
TRANSFER VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)**

Capella 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. Both of the Parties To This Lawsuit Are Based In the Northern District of California and Have No Meaningful Connection to Florida	2
1. Cisco has no meaningful connection to this District	2
2. Capella has no meaningful connection to this District	3
B. The Accused WSS Technology Was Designed by JDSU and other Third-Party Companies, All of Whom are Headquartered and Have Relevant Witnesses in the Northern District of California	3
1. Capella claims WSS devices are at the heart of the infringement issue.....	3
2. The development of the WSS technology is centered in the Northern District of California, just a few miles from both Cisco and Capella.....	4
C. Key Witnesses For Each of the Major Issues in the Case Reside Outside of the Southern District of Florida, and Most Reside in the Northern District of California	5
1. Key witnesses relevant to non-infringement are in the Northern District of California	5
2. Key witnesses to Capella's inequitable conduct are located in the Northern District of California.....	6
3. Key witnesses relevant to invalidity are located in the Northern District of California	8
4. Key witnesses relevant to damages are located in the Northern District of California	8
5. Important sources of relevant documents and physical evidence are in the Northern District of California.....	9
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	10
IV. ARGUMENT.....	11
A. This Action Could Have Been Brought in the Northern District of California	11
B. The Public and Private Interest Factors Strongly Favor Transfer to the Northern District of California.....	11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)**

	Page
1. The locus of operative facts is in the Northern District of California	11
2. Capella’s choice of forum is entitled to little deference because the operative facts have no connection to this District	13
3. The convenience of the majority of known witnesses strongly favors transfer to the Northern District of California	14
4. Access to the California-based sources of proof favors transfer	16
5. The convenience of the California-based parties favors transfer.....	16
6. The availability of compulsory process in the Northern District of California strongly favors transfer	16
7. The relative means of both parties would improve with transfer to the home jurisdiction for those parties.....	18
8. This case presents issues unique to California state law—favoring transfer	18
9. The interests of justice strongly favors transfer to the home forum of the parties and the key witnesses—the Northern District of California	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>In re Acer America Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Cellularvision Techs. & Telecomm., L.P. v. Alltel Corp.</i> , 508 F. Supp. 2d 1186 (S.D. Fla. 2007).....	13
<i>In re EMC Corp.</i> , 501 F. App'x. 973 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	11, 20
<i>In re EMC Corp.</i> , 677 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	20
<i>Evans Design Dynamics, LLC v. Nike, Inc.</i> , No. 8:12-cv-493-JDW-TBM (M.D. Fla.)	13
<i>Game Controller Tech., LLC v. Sony Computer Entm't Am. LLC</i> , No. 13-civ-22795, 2014 WL 321862 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 10, 2014).....	14
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14, 16
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	10
<i>Manuel v. Convergys Corp.</i> , 430 F.3d 1132 (11th Cir. 2005)	10
<i>Mayfonk, Inc. v. Nike, Inc.</i> , No. 13-civ-60755, at 4-5 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 17, 2013).....	15, 19
<i>In re Microsoft Corp.</i> , 630 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10
<i>Motorola Mobility, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 804 F. Supp. 2d 1271 (S.D. Fla. 2011)	12
<i>Neil Bros. Ltd. v. World Wide Lines, Inc.</i> , 425 F. Supp. 2d 325 (E.D.N.Y. 2006)	14
<i>In re Nintendo Co.</i> , 589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>In re Nintendo Co.</i> , 544 F. App'x. 934 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	20
<i>In re Spalding Sports Worldwide, Inc.</i> , 203 F.3d 800 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	18
<i>Thermal Techs., Inc. v. Dade Serv. Corp.</i> , 282 F. Supp. 2d 1373 (S.D. Fla. 2003)	10
<i>In re Toyota Motor Corp.</i> , 2014-113 (Fed. Cir. April 3, 2014).....	10, 15, 20
<i>Trace-Wilco, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , No. 08-civ-80877, 2009 WL 455432 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 23, 2009).....	12, 13
<i>In re TS Tech USA Corp.</i> , 551 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	18, 19
<i>In re Verizon Bus. Network Serv. Inc.</i> , 635 F.3d 559 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	11, 20
<i>Wi-Lan USA, Inc. v. Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc.</i> , No. 12-civ-23568, 2013 WL 358385 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 29, 2013).....	10
 STATUTES	
28 U.S.C.	
§ 1391(c)	11
§ 1400(b).....	11
§ 1404(a).....	1, 10, 11
35 U.S.C.	
§ 287.....	8
§ 299(a)(1)	20
Business and Professions Code	
§ 17200.....	18, 19

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.