

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

RFCYBER CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC and GOOGLE PAYMENT
CORP.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-00274-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FILED UNDER SEAL

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO TRANSFER OR,
IN THE ALTERNATIVE, TO DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED	2
III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. The Location of the Relevant Witnesses and Evidence.....	2
1. Google and GPC’s Relevant Employees and Documentary Evidence Are in the Northern District of California.....	2
2. Plaintiff’s Directors, Officers, and Documentary Evidence Are in the Northern District of California.....	3
3. Nearly All Relevant Third Parties, Including the Inventors, Are in the Northern District of California.....	3
B. Plaintiff’s Venue-Related Allegations with Respect to GPC and Google.....	5
IV. LEGAL STANDARD.....	6
A. Law Governing Motion to Transfer.....	6
B. Law Governing Motion to Dismiss.....	7
V. MOTION TO TRANSFER TO THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	7
A. Plaintiff’s Alleged Ties to this District Carry No Weight.	8
B. The Private Interest Factors Favor Transfer.	9
1. The Convenience of the Witnesses Favors Transfer.....	9
2. The Availability of Compulsory Process Favors Transfer.	12
3. Ease of Access to Relevant Sources of Proof Favors Transfer.....	12
4. Practical Considerations Weigh in Favor of Transfer.....	13
C. The Public Interest Factors Favor Transfer.	14
1. The Northern District of California’s Interests Favor Transfer.	14
2. The Time to Resolution Is Neutral.....	15
3. The Remaining Public Interest Factors Are Neutral.....	15
D. The Balance of the Private and Public Interest Factors Favors Transfer.....	16
VI. MOTION TO DISMISS OR TRANSFER FOR IMPROPER VENUE.....	16
A. Plaintiff Has Failed to Demonstrate that GPC Has a Place Of Business Within this District.....	17
B. Plaintiff Has Failed to Demonstrate that Google Has a Place of Business Within this District.....	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
1. Google Does Not Offer Google Fi from any Physical Place of Business in this District.	19
2. [REDACTED] and, Even If It Had Not, Google Did Not Offer the Service from a Physical Place of Business.....	20
4. Google Does Not Offer Interconnect Services from any Location in this District, And Google Does Not Own, Operate, Or Control the Equipment Identified by Plaintiff.	21
5. Google’s Receipt of Services from CTDI Does Not Establish a Regular and Established Place of Business of Google in this District.....	21
(a) CTDI Is Not Google’s Agent Because It Does Not Have Authority to Alter Google’s Legal Relations with Third Persons.	22
(b) CTDI Is Not Google’s Agent Because Google Does Not Exercise Interim Control over CTDI’s Operations.	24
(c) CTDI Performs Only Ancillary Services for Google and Does Not Conduct Google’s Business.	28
6. Plaintiff’s Remaining Allegations Do Not Satisfy the Patent Venue Statute.	29
C. Alternatively, The Court Should Transfer this Case to the Northern District of California Under 28 U.S.C. § 1406.	30
VII. CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>In re Acer Am. Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	14
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. HTC Corp.</i> , 937 F. Supp. 2d 867 (E.D. Tex. 2013).....	9, 12
<i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Huawei Device USA Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 2329752 (E.D. Tex. May 23, 2018).....	9
<i>AGIS Software Dev., LLC v. ZTE Corp.</i> , 2018 WL 4854023 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2018).....	17
<i>Amini Innovation Corp. v. Bank & Estate Liquidators, Inc.</i> , 512 F. Supp. 2d 1039 (S.D. Tex. 2007)	8, 9
<i>Andra Grp., LP v. Victoria’s Secret Stores, LLC</i> , 2020 WL 1465894 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 26, 2020)	18
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	7
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , 581 F. App’x 886 (Fed. Cir. 2014)	12
<i>Arguello v. Conoco, Inc.</i> , 207 F.3d 803 (5th Cir. 2000)	24, 28
<i>ATEN Int’l Co. v. Emine Tech. Co.</i> , 261 F.R.D. 112 (E.D. Tex. 2009).....	15
<i>Camreta v. Greene</i> , 563 U.S. 692 (2011).....	22
<i>Carnell Const. Corp. v. Danville Redevelopment & Hous. Auth.</i> , 745 F.3d 703 (4th Cir. 2014)	24
<i>CNE Direct, Inc. v. Blackberry Corp.</i> , 821 F.3d 146 (1st Cir. 2016).....	23
<i>In re Cray Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	1, passim

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Deep Green Wireless LLC v. Ooma, Inc.</i> 2017 WL 679643 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2017)	12
<i>In re EMC Corp.</i> , 501 F. App'x 973 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	14
<i>EMED Techs. Corp. v. Repto-Med Sys., Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 2544564 (E.D. Tex. June 4, 2018)	18
<i>ES Distribution, LLC, v. Hangtime LLC</i> , 2020 WL 6689755 (D.N.J. Nov. 13, 2020)	28
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	6, 9, 12, 15
<i>In re Google LLC</i> , 823 F. App'x 982 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	22
<i>In re Google</i> , 2017 WL 977038 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	14, 15
<i>In re Google</i> , 949 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	17, passim
<i>Hoffman v. Blaski</i> , 363 U.S. 335 (1960).....	7, 14
<i>In re Hoffmann–LaRoche</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	8, 15
<i>In re HP Inc.</i> , 826 F. App'x 899 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	14
<i>Kranos IP Corp. v. Riddell, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3704762 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 28, 2017)	17
<i>Largan Precision Co. v. Ability Opto-Elecs. Tech. Co.</i> , 2020 WL 3078042 (E.D. Tex. June 10, 2020)	15
<i>Lowery v. Estelle</i> , 533 F.2d 265 (5th Cir. 1976)	30
<i>Lynch v. Nat'l Prescription Administrators, Inc.</i> , 795 F. App'x 68 (2d Cir. 2020)	26

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.