

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

Formed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Karen A. Confoy

Allison L. Hollows

Princeton Pike Corporate Center

997 Lenox Drive, Building 3

Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

Telephone: 609.896.3600

Facsimile: 609.896.1469

kconfoy@foxrothschild.com

ahollows@foxrothschild.com

**SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER
& HAMPTON LLP**

A Limited Liability Partnership

Including Professional Corporations

Stephen S. Korniczky (*pro hac vice*)

Martin R. Bader (*pro hac vice*)

Ericka J. Schulz (*pro hac vice*)

12275 El Camino Real, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92130

Telephone: 858.720.8900

Facsimile: 858.509.3691

skorniczky@sheppardmullin.com

mbader@sheppardmullin.com

eschulz@sheppardmullin.com

Counsel for Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiffs

HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

INVT SPE LLC,

Plaintiff

v.

HTC Corporation, and

HTC America, Inc.,

Defendants.

) Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-03740-JMV-JBC

)

)

)

)

Filed Electronically

)

)

RETURN DATE: APRIL 16, 2018

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

)

)

**DEFENDANTS HTC CORPORATION AND HTC AMERICA, INC.'S
REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO TRANSFER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. HTC’s And Qualcomm’s Detailed, Unrebutted Affidavits Show The Operative Facts On Key Issues Center Around California, Not New Jersey—Greatly Favoring Transfer.	3
1. The Infringement Investigation Will Center Around Qualcomm.	4
2. The Carriers Are Not Relevant To Venue In This Case.....	6
3. The Remedies INVT Seeks Rely On Inventergy’s Actions, And HTC Asserts Defenses Based On Inventergy’s Failure To Provide Notice Or Offer A License On FRAND Terms.....	8
4. Panasonic’s U.S. Entity Has No Ties To This Case.....	9
B. Given The Weight Of HTC’s Evidence, The Balance Of Private Factors Favors Transfer To CAND.	10
C. The Public Factors Favor Transfer To CAND.....	13
III. CONCLUSION	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)	
<u>Cases</u>		
<i>Audatex N. Am. v. Mitchell Int’l, Inc.</i>		
No. 12-cv-139, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90847 (D. Del. June 28, 2013)	9, 12	
<i>Brandywine Commc’ns. Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i>		
No. 12-cv-262, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 198355 (M.D. Fla. Aug., 23, 2012).....	6	
<i>Briger v. Loon Mt. Resort</i>		
No. 2:14-cv-5374(KM)(MAH), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 189254 (D.N.J. May 19, 2015)	10	
<i>Core Wireless Licensing, S.A.R.L. v. Apple, Inc.</i>		
No. 6:12-cv-100, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24922 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 22, 2013).....	12	
<i>Hemstreet v. Caere Corp.</i>		
No. 90-cv-377, 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6782 (N.D. Ill. June 5, 1990)	5, 15	
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i>		
587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	13, 15	
<i>Hostetler v. Baltimore & O.R. Co.</i>		
164 F. Supp. 72 (D. Pa. 1958).....	3, 6, 8	
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , F. App’x 886, 889 (Fed. Cir. 2014), 35 U.S.C. § 1407		14, 15
<i>In re Link</i>		
<i>_A_Media Devices Corp.</i> , 662 F.3d 1221, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	10	
<i>Quintiles IMS, Inc. v. Veeva Sys.</i>		
No. 2:17-cv-177(CCC)(MF), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97905 (D.N.J. June 23, 2017)	12	
<i>Ricoh v. Honeywell</i>		
817 F. Supp. 473 (D.N.J. 1993)	3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10	

Smart Audio Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.
910 F. Supp. 2d 718 (D. Del. 2012) 10, 12

Spathos v. Payment Plan, LLC
No. 3:15-cv-8014(MAS)(DEA), 2016 WL 3951672 (D.N.J. July
21, 2016)..... 14

Symantec Corp. v. Zscaler, Inc.
No. 17-cv-806, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 119528 (D. Del. July 31,
2017) 12

Tischio v. Bontex, Inc.
16 F. Supp. 2d 511 (D.N.J. 1998)..... 15

...

I. INTRODUCTION

In their Motion to Transfer, HTC Corp. and HTC America, Inc. (together, “HTC”) submitted sworn affidavits, including from third-party Qualcomm, Inc. (“Qualcomm”), demonstrating that the operative facts of this case center around California—not New Jersey. Frank Wu of HTC declared it is Qualcomm chips in the Accused Products that implement the cellular standards at issue in this case. Thus, discovery regarding Qualcomm chips will be *necessary* to prove infringement or non-infringement. Mr. Wu also confirmed that *only Qualcomm* can provide the source code and facts regarding the functionality of its chips.

Qualcomm also declared that the vast majority of its U.S. witnesses most knowledgeable of the *exact* cellular standard features and Technical Specifications recited in INVT’s Complaint are located in *California*, including: EGPRS and EGPRS2 (TS 45.001, 45.003 and 45.004); UMTS, WCDMA, HSPA (TS 25.308, 25.214, 25.319, 25.321, 25.212, 25.214); and LTE (TS. 36.211, 36.213, 36.300). HTC must be able to compel Qualcomm’s most relevant and knowledgeable witnesses to attend trial, which HTC can do only in California.

In response to HTC and Qualcomm’s evidence, INVT failed to submit any affidavits or provide any concrete evidence that New Jersey witnesses with knowledge of the *specific* cellular standard features, Technical Specifications, or Qualcomm chips at issue in this case actually *exist*. Instead, INVT provided only

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.