

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION

PACT XPP SCHWEIZ AG	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	C.A. No. 6:19-cv-00273-ADA
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
INTEL CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**INTEL CORPORATION'S MOTION TO DISMISS, STAY, OR TRANSFER**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1
- II. STATEMENT OF FACTS ..... 3
  - A. PACT filed this complaint in anticipation of Intel’s forthcoming motion to transfer the Delaware Case to a more convenient forum. .... 3
  - B. Neither PACT nor the asserted patents have any connection to Texas. .... 5
  - C. Intel is headquartered in California and relevant evidence is located there. .... 6
- III. LEGAL STANDARD..... 8
- IV. ARGUMENT..... 10
  - A. Dismissal is warranted because PACT’s bad faith, anticipatory filing, and forum-shopping negate the first-to-file rule..... 10
  - B. The interests of justice also favor transfer to the Northern District of California. .... 13
    - 1. PACT could have brought this case in the Northern District of California. .... 14
    - 2. The private-interest factors favor transfer to the Northern District of California. .... 14
    - 3. The public-interest factors also favor transfer to the Northern District of California. .... 18
- V. CONCLUSION..... 19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Altera Corp. v. PACT XPP Techs., AG</i> , Civil Action No. 3:14-cv-02868-JD (N.D. Cal.) .....	8
<i>Battee v. Ben E. Keith Co.</i> , No. 17-0161, 2017 WL 1832043 (E.D. Tex. May 5, 2017).....	17
<i>DataQuill, Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. A-13-CA-706-SS, 2014 WL 2722201 (W.D. Tex. June 13, 2014).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Elecs. for Imaging, Inc. v. Coyle</i> , 394 F.3d 1341 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	8, 9, 13
<i>Exxon Chem. Patents, Inc. v. Lubrizol Corp.</i> , 935 F.2d 1263 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (Newman, J. concurring).....	10
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15, 16
<i>Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 v. Intel Corp.</i> , Case No. 2:17-CV-00676-RWS-RSP, D.I. 157, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2018) .....	17
<i>Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 v. Xilinx, Inc.</i> , No. 17-100, 2017 WL 4076052 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 14, 2017).....	17
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	19
<i>Intel Corp. v. PACT XPP Schweiz AG</i> , C.A. No. 3:19-cv-02241-WHA (N.D. Cal.).....	1, 4, 10
<i>Micron Tech., Inc. v. Mosaid Techs., Inc.</i> , 518 F.3d 897 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Neil Bros. Ltd v. World Wide Lines, Inc.</i> , 425 F. Supp. 2d 325 (E.D.N.Y. 2006) .....	15
<i>PACT XPP Schweiz AG v. Intel Corp.</i> , D.I. 1, C.A. No. 19-267 (RGA) (D. Del.) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>PACT XPP Techs., AG v. Xilinx</i> , Case No. 2:07-cv-563-RSP (E.D. Tex.).....	8

..

*PPS Data, LLC v. Diebold, Inc.*,  
 No. 2:12:-cv-TC, 2012 WL 1884655 (D. Utah May 22, 2012) .....9, 11, 12, 13

*Raz Imports, Inc. v. Luminara Worldwide, LLC*,  
 No. 3:15-cv-02223-M, 2015 WL 6692107 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 3, 2015) .....8, 11

*Serco Servs. Co., L.P. v. Kelley Co.*,  
 51 F.3d 1037 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....8, 10, 11

*Sport Supply Grp., Inc. v. R&G Prods., Inc.*,  
 No. 3:08-cv-02031-O, 2009 WL 10677398 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2009).....11

*Valeo, Inc. v. Fed.-Mogul Corp.*,  
 No. EP-13-CV-115-PRM, 2013 WL 8480673 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 17, 2013) .....9, 10, 15, 18

*In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*,  
 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) (*en banc*) ..... *passim*

*Ward v. Follett Corp.*,  
 158 F.R.D. 645 (N.D. Cal. 1994).....13

*Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. Tr. for Natividad Caballero 2007 Ins. Tr. v. Principal  
 Life Ins. Co.*, No. CV-09-00068-DDP (RZX), 2009 WL 10671947  
 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2009).....11

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) .....14

28 U.S.C. § 1404.....8

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) ..... *passim*

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(3).....1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....1

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), 12(b)(3), and 12(b)(6) and 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), Defendant Intel Corporation (“Intel”), by and through its counsel, moves to dismiss, or in the alternative, stay or transfer this case (the “Texas Case”) in favor of Intel’s co-pending declaratory judgment action against PACT XPP Schweiz AG (“PACT”) in the Northern District of California (the “California Case”) involving the same 12 patents asserted here.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

This District was not PACT’s preferred forum. PACT originally sued Intel in Delaware (the “Delaware Case”) on the same 12 patents asserted here. Only after learning that Intel intended to move for transfer to a more convenient forum near its engineering facilities in Oregon did PACT suddenly abandon its Delaware Case to file in Texas—a transparent attempt to thwart Intel’s transfer. Intel promptly filed the California Case to secure a more convenient forum, but this time near its headquarters in the Northern District of California where PACT is subject to personal jurisdiction. PACT maintains that its “first filed” Texas action—filed merely one day before the California Case—should control. But PACT’s tactical end-run around convenience should not be rewarded, and the “first filed” rule it relies on does not apply in cases of forum shopping. Intel respectfully asks this Court to dismiss, stay, or transfer this case to the Northern District of California, where Intel is headquartered, and where Intel’s declaratory judgment action on the same 12 PACT asserted patents is currently pending.

There is no question PACT filed this case based on an improper forum shopping motive:

- When it filed the Texas Case, PACT already had a pending case against Intel, initiated three months earlier in Delaware, alleging the exact same claims;
- Intel informed PACT that it intended to file a motion to transfer the Delaware Case to Oregon because, in part, it would be far more convenient and efficient to litigate this case near Intel’s engineering facilities there and because PACT and the dispute have no connection to Delaware;

# 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.