

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

XR COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, dba)	
VIVATO TECHNOLOGIES,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	The Honorable
)	Alan D. Albright
-vs.-)	
)	No.: 6:21-cv-00619-ADA
AMAZON.COM, INC., AMAZON.COM)	
SERVICES LLC, and EERO LLC,)	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
)	
Defendants.)	

**DEFENDANT EERO LLC'S MOTION TO
DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE OR, ALTERNATIVELY,
TO TRANSFER TO THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.
EXHIBIT 1102

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ----- 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND ----- 1

 I. THE COMPLAINT’S VENUE ALLEGATIONS ----- 1

 II. EERO’S LACK OF PRESENCE IN TEXAS----- 2

LEGAL STANDARD ----- 3

 I. MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER 12(b)(3) ----- 3

 II. THE PATENT VENUE STATUTE REQUIREMENTS ARE CLEAR ----- 3

 III. TRANSFER UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1406(A) ----- 5

ARGUMENT ----- 6

 I. THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS IS AN IMPROPER VENUE
FOR EERO AND THE COMPLAINT AGAINST EERO
SHOULD BE DISMISSED ----- 6

 A. eero Does Not Reside in the Western
District of Texas----- 6

 B. eero Does Not Have a Regular and Established Place of
Business in the Western District of Texas----- 7

 1. eero Does Not Have a Physical Place in
the Western District of Texas ----- 7

 2. eero Does Not Have a Regular and
Established Place of Business in This District----- 8

 3. Any Locations in the Western District
Are Not eero’s Place of Business----- 9

 II. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, THIS COURT SHOULD TRANSFER
THIS CASE TO THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ----- 11

CONCLUSION----- 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Cases:</i>	<i>Page(s):</i>
<i>Action Indus., Inc. v. US. Fid. & Guar. Co.</i> , 358 F.3d 337 (5th Cir. 2004) -----	5
<i>Affinity Labs of Texas, LLC v. Blackberry Ltd.</i> , No. 6:13-CV-362, 2014 WL 10748106 (W.D. Tex. June 11, 2014)-----	13
<i>Am. Cyanamid Co. v. NOPCO Chem. Co.</i> , 388 F.2d 818 (4th Cir. 1968) -----	5
<i>Ambraco, Inc. v. Bossclip B.V.</i> , 570 F.3d 233 (5th Cir. 2009) -----	3
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Caterpillar, Inc.</i> , No. 6:16-CV-01361-RWS, 2017 WL 4129321 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 19, 2017) -----	3, 10
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Nook Digital, LLC</i> , No. 6:16-CV-1361-RWS-JDL, 2017 WL 3263871 (E.D. Tex. July 28, 2017) -----	10
<i>Braspetro Oil Servs. Co. v. Modec (USA), Inc.</i> , 240 F. App'x 612 (5th Cir. 2007)-----	3
<i>Correct Transmission LLC v. ADTRAN, Inc.</i> , No. 6:20-cv-00669-ADA, 2021 WL 1967985 (W.D. Tex. May 17, 2021) -----	<i>passim</i>
<i>CUPP Cybersecurity LLC v. Symantec Corp.</i> , No. 3:18-CV-01554-M, 2019 WL 1070869 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 16, 2019)-----	11
<i>DataQuill, Ltd. v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. A-13-CA-706-SS, 2014 WL 2722201 (W.D. Tex. June 13, 2014)-----	13
<i>EMED Techs. Corp. v. Repro-Med Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 2:17-CV-728-WCB-RSP, 2018 WL 2544564 (E.D. Tex. June 4, 2018) -----	6, 11
<i>In re Cray Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017) -----	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Radmax Ltd.</i> , 720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013) -----	5
<i>In re Volkswagen AG</i> , 371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004) -----	5
<i>In re Volkswagen of America, Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 304, 312 (5th Cir. 2004) (en banc) -----	5

Koss Corp. v. Skullcandy, Inc.,
 No. 6-20-CV-00664-ADA, 2021 WL 1226557 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2021) ----- *passim*

Magnacoustics, Inc. v. Resonance Tech. Co.,
 No. 97-1247, 1997 WL 592863 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 25, 1997) ----- 3, 9, 10

MasterObjects, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
 No. 20 CV 3478 (PKC), 2020 WL 6075528 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 15, 2020)----- 11

Nat’l Steel Car Ltd. v. Greenbrier Cos., Inc.,
 No. 6:19-cv-00721-ADA, 2020 WL 4289388 (W.D. Tex. Jul. 27, 2020) ----- 5, 9

Phillips v. Baker,
 121 F.2d 752 (9th Cir. 1941) ----- 9

TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Food Grp. Brands LLC,
 137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017)----- 3, 4, 6

Vocalife LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
 No. 2:19-CV-00123-JRG, 2019 WL 6345191 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 27, 2019) ----- 11

Westech Aerosol Corp. v. 3M Co.,
 927 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2019) ----- 4

XR Communications, LLC, v. Ruckus Wireless, Inc., et al.,
 No. 18-CV-01992-WHO, 2021 WL 3918136 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 1, 2021) ----- 12

Statutes:

28 U.S.C. § 1400 ----- *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 1406 ----- 1, 5, 13

28 U.S.C. § 1440 ----- 4

Rules:

Fed. Rule Civ. P. 12----- 1, 5, 13

Miscellaneous:

14D Wright & Miller, Fed. Prac. & Pro., § 3823 ----- 10

INTRODUCTION

Defendant eero LLC (“eero”) respectfully moves to dismiss for improper venue under Rule 12(b)(3) and 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), or, alternatively, to transfer venue to the Northern District of California. Proper venue in a patent infringement suit is “in the judicial district where the defendant resides” or “where the defendant has committed acts of infringement and has a regular and established place of business.” 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). Under either part of the statute, venue in the Western District of Texas is improper as to eero.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. THE COMPLAINT’S VENUE ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff XR Communications LLC d/b/a Vivato Technologies (“plaintiff” or “Vivato”) filed its complaint in this Court on June 16, 2021, against defendants Amazon.com, Inc., Amazon.com Services LLC (collectively, the “Amazon defendants”), and eero, alleging infringement of United States Patent Nos. 10,594,376 and 10,715,235. (D.I. 1, Compl. ¶¶ 16-18, 23-26, 44-46.) Vivato’s complaint states that venue is proper against all three defendants in the Western District of Texas because:

Defendants have a permanent and continuous presence in, have committed acts of infringement in, and maintain regular and established places of business in this district. Defendants have committed acts of direct and indirect infringement in this judicial district including using and purposefully transacting business involving the Accused Products in this judicial district such as by sales to one or more customers in the State of Texas including in the Western District of Texas, and maintaining regular and established places of business in this district, including, for example, their Amazon Tech Hub located at 11501 Alterra Parkway, Austin, TX.

(*Id.* ¶ 23.)

Specific to eero, Vivato’s complaint alleges that eero has a principal place of business in California and is incorporated in Delaware. (D.I. 1, Compl. ¶ 18.) Vivato’s complaint further

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.