

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

SCRAMOGE TECHNOLOGY LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:21-cv-00616-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

[REDACTED]

REDACTED DOCUMENT

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. BACKGROUND..... 2

    A. Relevant Third-Party Witnesses And Evidence Are in The N.D. Cal..... 2

    B. All of Google’s Relevant Evidence and Witnesses Are In The N.D. Cal. .... 3

    C. Plaintiff’s Evidence And Witnesses Are Not In The W.D. Tex. .... 4

III. ARGUMENT ..... 4

    A. Plaintiff Could Have Brought This Action In The N.D. Cal. .... 5

    B. All Private Interest Factors Are Neutral Or Favor Transfer To The N.D. Cal. .... 5

        1. Availability Of Compulsory Process Favors Transfer To The N.D. Cal.....6

        2. Cost of Attendance For Willing Witnesses Heavily Favors Transfer To The N.D. Cal. ....7

        3. Relative Ease Of Access To Sources Of Proof Favors Transfer To The N.D. Cal. ....10

        4. There Are No Practical Problems With Transferring This Case .....11

    C. The Public Interest Factors Also Favor Transfer..... 12

        1. The N.D. Cal. Has A Strong Local Interest In This Dispute, While W.D. Tex. Has None.....12

        2. The Remaining Public Interest Factors Are Neutral.....13

IV. CONCLUSION ..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <i>10Tales, Inc. v. TikTok Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:20-CV-00810-ADA, 2021 WL 2043978 (W.D. Tex. May 21, 2021) .....                                | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Adaptix, Inc. v. HTC Corp.</i> ,<br>937 F. Supp. 2d 867 (E.D. Tex. March 28, 2013) .....   | 6             |
| <i>In re Adobe Inc.</i> ,<br>823 F. App'x 929 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....  | 9, 14         |
| <i>Aguilar-Ayala v. Ruiz</i> ,<br>973 F.2d 411 (5th Cir. 1992) .....  | 6             |
| <i>In re Apple Inc.</i> ,<br>979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....  | 10, 12        |
| <i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>581 F. App'x 886 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....   | 7             |
| <i>Bluebonnet Internet Media Servs., LLC v. Pandora Media, LLC</i> ,<br>No. 6-20-CV-00731-ADA, 2021 WL 3134262 (W.D. Tex. July 22, 2021)..... | 13            |
| <i>Correct Transmission LLC v. ADTRAN, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:20-CV-00669-ADA, 2021 WL 1967985 (W.D. Tex. May 17, 2021) .....                    | 10            |
| <i>In re Cray Inc.</i> ,<br>871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....   | 5             |
| <i>Fintiv, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:18-CV-00372-ADA, 2019 WL 4743678 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 10, 2019) .....                               | 6             |
| <i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> ,<br>566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....   | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Harland Clarke Holdings Corp. v. Milken</i> ,<br>997 F. Supp. 2d 561 (W.D. Tex. 2014).....   | 15            |
| <i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> ,<br>587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....  | 12            |
| <i>In re HP Inc.</i> ,<br>826 F. App'x 899 (2020) .....   | 11            |
| <i>Koss Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>6:20-cv-00665-ADA, Order, ECF No. 76 (W.D. Tex. April 22, 2021) .....                                   | 14            |

*Moskowitz Family LLC v. Globus Med.*,  
 No. 6:19-cv-00672, 2020 WL 4577710 (W.D. Tex. July 2, 2020).....10, 11

*In re Nintendo Co.*,  
 589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....2, 5, 13

*Parus Holdings Inc. v. LG Elecs. Inc.*,  
 No. 6:19-CV-00432-ADA, 2020 WL 4905809 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2020).....9, 14

*Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*,  
 454 U.S. 235 (1981).....5

*Polaris Innovations, Ltd. v. Dell, Inc.*  
 No. SA-16-CV-451-XR, 2016 WL 7077069 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 5, 2016).....8

*In re Radmax, Ltd.*,  
 720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013) .....15

*In re Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*,  
 2 F.4th 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....7, 12, 13

*In re Toyota Motor Corp.*,  
 747 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....5

*In re Tracfone Wireless, Inc.*,  
 No. 2021-136, 852 Fed. Appx. 537 (Fed. Cir. Apr. 20, 2021) .....9

*In re TS Tech USA Corp.*,  
 551 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....5, 12, 15

*In re Volkswagen AG*,  
 371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004) .....8, 9

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

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) .....5

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) ..... *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 1783.....7

**Other Authorities**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(1).....6, 7

## I. INTRODUCTION

This Court should transfer this action against Google LLC (“Google”) brought by an Irish non-practicing entity and related to technology with no relevant ties to this District. Google respectfully requests the transfer of this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) to the Northern District of California (“N.D. Cal.”). The N.D. Cal. is clearly more convenient than the Western District of Texas (“W.D. Tex.”) and is the proper venue for this action.

- First, Plaintiff Scramoge Technology Limited (“Plaintiff” or “Scramoge”) alleges infringement by Google because of the custom wireless charging components found in Google’s Pixel 3, 3XL, 4, 4XL, and 5 smartphones (collectively, the “Pixel Products”). The Pixel Products’ custom wireless charging components and functionality are designed and developed in the N.D. Cal. Two of the three third-party suppliers who provide the charging components at issue to Google maintain their United States offices in the N.D. Cal. The remaining third-party supplier is in Southern California.
- Second, Plaintiff has no relevant ties to the W.D. Tex. Plaintiff does not have any places of business in Texas. Plaintiff is incorporated in and operates out of Dublin, Ireland. Plaintiff is a patent assertion entity that does not make, use, sell, or offer to sell any products. Plaintiff acquired the patents-in-suit from a third party with no connection to the W.D. Tex. The original assignee of the patents-in-suit is in Seoul, Korea.

The only relevant ties that Google or any third parties have are in California. Google’s headquarters are in the N.D. Cal., along with all identified relevant witnesses and sources of proof, including physical sources of proof. Additionally, the majority of the relevant third parties (two out of the three foreign suppliers of the component parts at issue), have locations in N.D. Cal.

# 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.