

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

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

APPLE INC.,  
*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil No. 6:21-cv-00579-ADA

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER – PUBLIC VERSION**

This opinion memorializes the Court’s decision on Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple” or “Defendant”) Motion to Transfer Venue from the Western District of Texas (“WDTX”) to the Northern District of California (“NDCA”) under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Dkt. No. 37. After careful consideration of the relevant facts, applicable law, and the parties’ briefs (Dkt. Nos. 67, 72), the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s Motion to Transfer and finds that Mark Rollins lacks credibility before this Court.

**I. BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Ltd. (“Scramoge” or “Plaintiff”) filed this lawsuit accusing Defendant of patent infringement. Dkt. No. 1. Scramoge alleges infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 10,622,842 (“the ’842 Patent”), 9,806,565 (“the ’565 Patent”), 10,804,740 (“the ’740 Patent”), 9,843,215 (“the ’215 Patent”), and 10,424,941 (“the ’941 Patent”) (collectively, “Asserted Patents”). Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 1. Broadly speaking, these patents cover aspects of wireless charging technology including wireless power coils that inductively charge, communication antennas related to power coils, the configuration of the coil, and magnetic layers used in a wireless charger. The accused products include the iPhone 8, 8 Plus, X, XR, XS, XS Max, 11, 11 Pro, 11 Pro Max, SE (second generation), 12, 12 mini, 12 Pro, 12 Pro Max, AirPods (second generation) and

AirPods Pro (“Accused Products”). *Id.* ¶¶ 9, 23. The parties later stipulated to a dismissal of the ’941 Patent from this case.

Scramoge is an Irish corporation with its principal place of business in Ireland. *Id.* ¶ 2.

Apple is a California corporation with a principal place of business in Cupertino, California and regular and established places of business at 12545 Riata Vista Circle, Austin, Texas 12801 Delcour Dr., Austin, Texas; 12801 Delcour Dr., Austin, Texas; and 3121 Palm Way, Austin, Texas 78758. *Id.* ¶¶ 5-6.

## II. LEGAL STANDRD

In patent cases, motions to transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) are governed by the law of the regional circuit. *In re TS Tech USA Corp.*, 551 F.3d 1315, 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2008). 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) provides that, “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” “Section 1404(a) is intended to place discretion in the district court to adjudicate motions for transfer according to an ‘individualized, case-by-case consideration of convenience and fairness.’” *Stewart Org., Inc. v. Ricoh Corp.*, 487 U.S. 22, 29 (1988) (quoting *Van Dusen v. Barrack*, 376 U.S. 612, 622 (1964)).

The preliminary question under Section 1404(a) is whether a civil action might have been brought in the transfer destination venue. *In re Volkswagen, Inc.*, 545 F.3d 304, 312 (5th Cir. 2008) (en banc) (“*Volkswagen IP*”). If the destination venue would have been a proper venue, then “[t]he determination of ‘convenience’ turns on a number of public and private interest factors, none of which can be said to be of dispositive weight.” *Action Indus., Inc. v. U.S. Fid. & Guar. Co.*, 358 F.3d 337, 340 (5th Cir. 2004). The private factors include: “(1) the relative ease of access to sources of proof; (2) the availability of compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses; (3) the

cost of attendance for willing witnesses; and (4) all other practical problems that make trial of a case easy, expeditious and inexpensive.” *In re Volkswagen AG*, 371 F.3d 201, 203 (5th Cir. 2004) (“*Volkswagen I*”) (citing *Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*, 454 U.S. 235, 241 n.6 (1981)). The public factors include: “(1) the administrative difficulties flowing from court congestion; (2) the local interest in having localized interests decided at home; (3) the familiarity of the forum with the law that will govern the case; and (4) the avoidance of unnecessary problems of conflict of laws of the application of foreign law.” *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 203.

The burden to prove that a case should be transferred for convenience falls on the moving party. *Volkswagen II*, 545 F.3d at 314. The burden that a movant must carry is not that the alternative venue is more convenient, but that it is clearly more convenient. *Id.* at 315. Although the plaintiff’s choice of forum is not a separate factor entitled to special weight, respect for the plaintiff’s choice of forum is encompassed in the movant’s elevated burden to “clearly demonstrate” that the proposed transferee forum is “clearly more convenient” than the forum in which the case was filed. *Id.* at 314-315. While “clearly more convenient” is not necessarily equivalent to “clear and convincing,” the moving party “must show materially more than a mere preponderance of convenience, lest the standard have no real or practical meaning.” *Quest NetTech Corp. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 2:19-cv-118, 2019 WL 6344267, at \*7 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 27, 2019).

### III. REPEAT DECLARANT MARK ROLLINS LACKS CREDIBILITY

Plaintiff argues that Apple’s Declarant, Mr. Mark Rollins, provided a vague, incomplete, and generally unreliable declaration. Dkt. No. 67, *passim*. On reply, Apple responds that the attacks on Mr. Rollins are “baseless.” Dkt. No. 72 at 1. The Court agrees with Plaintiff and resolves all conflicting evidence, where provided, against Mr. Rollins. The Court credits Mr. Rollins’s declaration only for its un rebutted statements.

Plaintiff argues that Mr. Rollins repeatedly makes the same type of vague and unreliable statements across multiple declarations. Dkt. No. 67 at 2-3 (citing to similarly vague representations in the Declaration of Mark Rollins in support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Billjco, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-CV-00528-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 10, 2021), Dkt. No. 26-1 (describing Apple's work on Bluetooth Low Energy iBeacon technology and products ranging from the iPhone 4s to the iPhone 12)).

The Court takes these allegations seriously because Mr. Rollins frequently and repeatedly submitted unreliable and misleading declarations to this Court. *E.g.*, Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Neonode Smartphone LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:20-cv-00505-ADA (W.D. Tex. Nov. 5, 2020), Dkt. No. 27-3 (describing Apple's work on user interface elements of Apple's smartphones and iPads); Declaration of Mark Rollins, *Koss Corp. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:20-cv-665-ADA (W.D. Tex. Dec. 21, 2020), Dkt. No. 34-2 (describing Apple's work on HomePods, AirPods, PowerBeats, Beats Solo, firmware, and source code); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *CPC Patent Tech. PTY LTD. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-CV-165-ADA, (W.D. Tex. May 4, 2021), Dkt. No. 22-2 (describing Apple's work on biometric security technology); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Gesture Tech. Partners LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-121-ADA (W.D. Tex. July 30, 2021), Dkt. No. 21-1 (describing Apple's work on camera technology in products including the iPhone 5-12 and many models and generations of iPads); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendants' Motion to Transfer Venue, *Red Rock Analytics LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-346-ADA-DTG (W.D. Tex. Aug. 24, 2021), Dkt. No. 45-17 (describing Apple's use of I-Q gain imbalance and 5G transceivers); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Apple's Motion to Transfer Venue,

*Logantree LP v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-397-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 3, 2021), Dkt. No. 23-1 (describing Apple's work on the Apple watch); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Identity Security LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-460-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 10, 2021), Dkt. No. 27-1 (describing Apple's work on microprocessors, iPhones 5S and later, MacBooks that contain specific chips, and Secure Enclave); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Traxcell Tech., LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-74-ADA (W.D. Tex. Sept. 21, 2021), Dkt. No. 34-1 (describing Apple's work on navigation technology); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion for Forum Non Conveniens, *MemoryWeb, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-531-ADA (W.D. Tex. Oct. 13, 2021) Dkt. No. 26-1 (describing Apple's work on file and photo organization in iPads, iPhones, iPods, and MacBooks); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Future Link Systems, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-263-ADA-DTG (W.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2021), Dkt. No. 36-2 (describing Apple's work on ARM-compliant bus and interconnect technology such as AMBA and DRAM memory chips including DDR3, DDR4, GDDR5, GDDR6, and HBM); Declaration of Mark Rollins, No. 6:21-cv-620-ADA (W.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2021), Dkt. No. 23-1 (describing the use of beamforming technology in iPhones, iPads, MacBooks, Macs, and Apple TV devices); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, *Sonrai Memory LTD. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 6:21-cv-401-ADA (W.D. Tex. Dec. 29, 2021), Dkt. No. 29-2 (describing the use of charge pump circuitry in Apple's products); Declaration of Mark Rollins in Support of Apple Inc.'s Motion to Transfer Venue, No. 6:21-cv-603-ADA-DTG (W.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2022), Dkt. No. 29-1 (describing Apple's work on wireless voice and data communication technology used in

# 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.