

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,)	Case No. 2:12-cv-02783-JPM-tmp
)	
Plaintiff,)	JURY DEMAND
)	
v.)	
)	
TWITTER, INC.)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

**DEFENDANT TWITTER, INC'S MOTION TO STAY
PROCEEDINGS PENDING RESOLUTION OF ITS
MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE
(WITH CERTIFICATE OF CONSULTATION)**

Defendant Twitter, Inc. respectfully moves this Court to stay all proceedings in this case, including proceedings called for in the Local Patent Rules, pending resolution of Twitter, Inc.'s motion to transfer this case to the Northern District of California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The facts and legal authorities supporting this relief are set forth in the accompanying memorandum. As set forth in the Certificate of Consultation below, Plaintiff has advised that while it cannot consent to this motion, it will not actively oppose it.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Glen G. Reid, Jr.

Glen G. Reid, Jr. (#8184)
greid@wyattfirm.com

/s/ Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.

Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr. (#06389)
mvorder-bruegge@wyattfirm.com

WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP

The Renaissance Center
1715 Aaron Brenner Dr., Suite 800
Memphis, TN 38120-4367

(901) 537-1000

-and-

J. David Hadden
dhadden@fenwick.com
Darren F. Donnelly
ddonnelly@fenwick.com
Saina S. Shamilov
sshamilov@fenwick.com
Ryan J. Marton
rmarton@fenwick.com
Clifford Web
cweb@fenwick.com
Justin Hulse
jhulse@fenwick.com
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street, 6th Floor
Mountain View, CA 94041
(650) 988-8500

**Attorneys for Defendant
TWITTER, INC.**

CERTIFICATE OF CONSULTATION

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that prior to the filing of the foregoing motion, substantive consultation was held between the undersigned and Richard Carter, counsel for plaintiff B.E. Technology, over multiple days culminating in a telephone discussion on February 7, 2013. At that time, B.E. Technology indicated that it would continue to oppose stay motions of the foregoing type in this and related cases. On the next afternoon, the Court granted several virtually identical motions for stay in related cases, and the undersigned re-contacted Mr. Carter to determine whether plaintiff would reconsider. As of 3:16 p.m. on this date, February 11, Mr. Carter advised that in light of the Court's rulings on the other stay motions, plaintiff cannot consent to, but "will not actively oppose" this stay motion.

/s/ Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.
Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing document was filed under the Court's CM/ECF system, automatically effecting service on counsel of record for all other parties who have appeared in this action on the date of such service.

/s/ Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.
Mark Vorder-Bruegge, Jr.

60323601.1
2/11/2013 4:17 pm