

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

BILLJCO, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-181

CISCO SYSTEMS INC'S MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. Procedural History	1
B. The Developers of the Accused Technology, as Well as Other Third-Party Witnesses, are in Northern California.....	2
C. Cisco and its Relevant Witnesses Are Also in Northern California	2
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	3
IV. ARGUMENT	4
A. BillJCo Could Have Filed This Case in the Northern District of California	4
B. Private-Interest Factors Heavily Favor Transfer.....	5
1. The sources of proof are in California	5
2. No compulsory process exists over relevant third-party witnesses in this District.....	7
3. Costs and burdens for willing witnesses are significantly less in California than in this District.....	7
4. Other practical concerns favor transfer	9
C. Public-Interest Factors Favor Transfer	9
1. California has a strong local interest in this case	9
2. Court congestion favors transfer	10
3. The other public interest factors are neutral	11
V. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Acer Am. Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	7
<i>Adaptix, Inc. v. HTC</i> , 837 F.Supp.2d 867 (E.D. Tex. Marh. 28, 2013)	6, 9
<i>In re Adobe</i> , No: 6:19-cv-00527-ADA (Fed. Cir. 2020)	11
<i>Am. Traffic Sols., Inc. v. B&W Sensors LLC</i> , No. 1:12-CV-504, 2013 WL 12138770 (E.D. Tex. Jan 14, 2013)	9
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 2021-187, slip. op. (Fed. Cir. Oct. 1, 2021)	8
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	11
<i>Auto. Body Parts Ass’n v. Ford Glob. Techs., LLC</i> , 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1987 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2015).....	8
<i>Creswell Holdings LLC v. Lenovo (U.S.) Inc.</i> , No. 4:15-CV-407, 2016 WL 615652 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 16, 2016).....	10
<i>E-Sys. Design, Inc. v. Mentor Graphics, Corp</i> , No. 4:17-CV-00682, 2018 WL 2463795 (E.D. Tex. June 1, 2018)	10
<i>In re EMC Corp., Decho Corp. and Iomega Corp.</i> , 677 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	3
<i>EON Corp. IP Holdings v. Sensus, USA, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 122562 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 9, 2012).....	6
<i>Groupchatter, LLC v. Landis + Gyr Techs.</i> , 2016 WL 541516 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2016)	9
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	7, 9
<i>In re Hoffman-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009)l	10

Network-1 Sec. Solutions, Inc. v. D-Link Corp.,
433 F. Supp. 2d 795 (E.D. Tex. 2006)5

In re Nintendo Co.,
589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....3, 9

On Semiconductor Corp. v. Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.,
No. 6:09-CV-390, 2010 WL 3855520 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2010).....6

Optimum Power Solutions LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
794 F. Supp. 2d 696 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....4

In re Radmax, Ltd.,
720 F.3d 285, 288 (5th Cir. 2013)6

Rembrandt Vision Techs., L.P. v. Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc.,
No. 2:09-cv-200-TJW, 2011 WL 2937365 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2011).....11, 12

TiVo, Inc. v. AT&T, Inc.,
2010 WL 11436066 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 17, 2010).....5

In re Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.,
2 F.4th 1371, 1380-81 (Fed. Cir. 2021)11

In re TOA Technologies,
543 F. App'x 1006 (Fed. Cir. 2013)6

In re TS Tech. USA Corp.,
551 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....11

Viking Techs. v. Assurant, Inc.,
2021 WL 3520756 (E.D. Tex. June 21, 2021).....10

In re Volkswagen AG,
371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004)3, 4

In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.,
545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008)4, 8

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1331.....4

28 U.S.C. §1404(a) *passim*

I. INTRODUCTION

As evidenced by motions to transfer by both Apple and Hewlett Packard Enterprises (“HPE”), this lawsuit is deeply rooted in the Northern District of California. The accused technologies were developed by Apple, and as laid out by Apple’s motion to transfer from the Western District of Texas (Ex. A), the overwhelming majority of sources of proof lie in Northern California. The story is largely the same for Cisco’s sources of proof, as Cisco’s relevant witnesses and documents are found in Northern California as well. The collective motions to transfer of Apple, HPE, and Cisco will allow this case to be conducted in a single forum that is most convenient to numerous witnesses across three cases, and to satisfy the important goal of judicial economy that is critical in the § 1404(a) analysis. Accordingly, Cisco respectfully requests that the Court transfer this matter to the Northern District of California.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Procedural History

On May 25, 2021, BillJCo filed a civil complaint in this Court against Cisco, alleging patent infringement of three U.S. Patents based on sales of products that implement features of Apple’s iBeacon standard for use in iOS and Android apps. D.I. 1, ¶ 25.

On the same day, BillJCo also filed complaints against Apple in the Western District of Texas, and HPE in the Eastern District of Texas. *BillJCo, LLC v. Apple Inc.*, Civil Action No. 6-21-cv-00528 (W.D. Tex); *BillJCo, LLC v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company and Aruba Networks, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 2-21-cv-00183 (E.D. Tex). These two complaints allege infringement of the same patents asserted against Cisco, by use of the same iBeacon standard developed by Apple (“accused technology”).

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.