### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS WACO DIVISION

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-00454-ADA



JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSED MOTION TO TRANSFER TO THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  |   |   | Page |  |
|------|--|---|---|------|--|
| I.   | INT  | TRODUCTION  |   |      |  |
| II.  | FACTUAL BACKGROUND                                   |   |   |      |  |
|      | A.   | No R  | elevant Samsung Employees or Documents Are in This District                               | 2    |  |
|      | В.   | Scrar   | moge's Evidence and Witnesses Are Not in This District                                    | 2    |  |
|      | C.   |   | moge's Allegations Against Samsung Mirror Those Against Apple Google                      | 3    |  |
|      | D.   | The Original Assignee's U.S. Headquarters, , and Prior Art Authors and Inventors Are Located In N.D. Cal. |   |      |  |
| III. | LEG  | AL STA  | ANDARD  | 4    |  |
| IV.  | THIS   | S CASE  | COULD HAVE BEEN FILED IN THE N.D. CAL   | 5    |  |
| V.   | N.D. CAL. IS THE MOST CONVENIENT FORUM FOR THIS CASE |   |   | 6    |  |
|      | A.   | The Private Interest Factors Heavily Favor Transfer to the N.D. Cal                                       |   |      |  |
|      |  | 1.  | The Relative Access to Sources of Proof   | 6    |  |
|      |  | 2.  | The Availability of Compulsory Process to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses              |      |  |
|      |  | 3.  | The Convenience of Third-Party Witnesses and Party Witnesses<br>Strongly Favors Transfer  | 8    |  |
|      |  | 4.  | All Other Practical Problems That Make Trial of a Case Easy, Expeditious, and Inexpensive | 9    |  |
|      | В.   | The Public Interest Factors Favor Transfer  |   |      |  |
| VI.  | CON  | ICLUSI  | ON  | 11   |  |



#### **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|   | 1 age(s) |
|---|----------|
| Cases   |          |
| 10Tales, Inc. v. TikTok Inc.,<br>No. 6:20-CV-00810-ADA, 2021 WL 2043978 (W.D. Tex. May 21, 2021)                  | 6, 8, 10 |
| Action Indus., Inc. v. U.S. Fid. & Guar. Co.,<br>358 F.3d 337 (5th Cir. 2004)                                     | 5        |
| DynaEnergetics Eur. GMBH v. Hunting Titan, Inc., No. 6:20-CV-00069-ADA, 2020 WL 3259807 (W.D. Tex. June 16, 2020) | 10       |
| In re Apple Inc.,<br>979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020)   | 6, 9, 11 |
| In re Apple, Inc.,<br>581 F. App'x 886 (Fed. Cir. 2014)   | 8        |
| In re Google Inc.,<br>No. 2017-107, 2017 WL 977038 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 23, 2017)                                      | 9        |
| In re Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,<br>2 F.4th 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2021)  | 5        |
| In re Volkswagen AG,<br>371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004)  | 5        |
| In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.,<br>545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008)  | passim   |
| In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc., 566 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2009)   | 9        |
| Parus Holdings Inc. v. LG Elecs. Inc.,<br>No. 6:19-CV-00432-ADA, 2020 WL 4905809 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2020)        | 9        |
| Polaris Innovations, Ltd. v. Dell, Inc.,<br>No. SA-16-CV-451-XR, 2016 WL 7077069 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 5, 2016)         | 8        |
| Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc.,<br>Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA   | 1        |
| Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Google LLC, Case No. 6:21-cv-00616-ADA  | 1        |
| Wet Sounds, Inc. v. Audio Formz, LLC,<br>No. A-17-CV-141-LY, 2017 WL 4547916 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 11, 2017)            | 9        |



## Case 6:21-cv-00454-ADA Document 43 Filed 01/07/22 Page 4 of 17

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

|                             | Page(s) |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Statutes                    |         |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3)      | 5       |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)         | 5       |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)         |         |
| Rules                       |         |
| Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(1)(A) | 7       |



• • •

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("SEC") and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. ("SEA") (collectively, "Samsung") seek transfer of this action to the Northern District of California ("N.D. Cal.") under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). N.D. Cal. is a clearly more convenient forum for this action.

In this action, an Irish entity asserts patents that it acquired from a Korean company against technology that was designed and engineered in Korea. Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Ltd. ("Scramoge") does not conduct any business in the United States, much less in the Western District of Texas ("W.D. Tex."), and does not appear to have any witnesses or documents in this District. Scramoge acquired the Asserted Patents¹ from LG Innotek Co., Ltd., a Korean entity, where Defendant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. is also incorporated, and where the accused products and functionality were designed and engineered. In short, there is zero nexus between this action and W.D. Tex., other than Scramoge's decision to file the complaint in this District.

Further, Scramoge's allegations mirror its allegations in separate cases against Apple Inc. ("Apple") and Google LLC ("Google").<sup>2</sup> Those companies have now moved to transfer their respective cases to N.D. Cal., and judicial economy weighs strongly in favor of litigating these cases in the same court. Moreover, key third-party witnesses, including the American arm of the original assignee of the Asserted Patents,

and authors and inventors of relevant prior art reside in N.D. Cal. Accordingly, the private and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Apple Inc., Case No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA (W.D. Tex.) ("Apple Action"); Scramoge Technology Ltd. v. Google LLC, Case No. 6:21-cv-00616-ADA (W.D. Tex.) ("Google Action").



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> U.S. Patent Nos. 9,553,476 ("the '476 Patent"), 9,825,482 ("the '482 Patent"), 9,997,962 ("the '962 Patent"), 9,843,215 ("the '215 Patent"), 10,367,370 ("the '370 Patent"), and 10,424,941 ("the '941 Patent") (collectively, "Asserted Patents").

# DOCKET

## 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.

