

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
WESTERN DIVISION**

**B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.,** )  
 )  
 **Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,** )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 **MATCH.COM L.L.C.,** )  
 )  
 **Defendant/Counterclaimant.** )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

**Case No. 2:12-cv-2834 JPM tmp**

**JURY DEMAND**

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT, MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT,  
AND CERTIFICATE OF CONSULTATION**

**MOTION**

Plaintiff B.E. Technology L.L.C. (“B.E.”) moves this Honorable Court to allow oral argument at a hearing on defendant Match.com L.L.C.’s (“Match”) Motion to Transfer Venue Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Concurrently herewith, B.E. requests that the Court also permit oral argument on the nearly identical transfer motions filed by Google, Inc. (“Google”), Amazon Digital Services, Inc. (“Amazon”), LinkedIn, Inc. (“LinkedIn”), Groupon, Inc. (“Groupon”), Pandora Media, Inc. (“Pandora”), Twitter, Inc. (“Twitter”), Barnes & Noble, Inc. (“Barnes & Noble”), Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC (“STA”), Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“SEA”), Sony Computer Entertainment America LLC (“SCEA”), Sony Mobile Communications (USA) Inc. (“SMC”), Sony Electronics, Inc. (“SEI”), Microsoft Corp. (“Microsoft”), Apple, Inc. (“Apple”), Spark Networks, Inc. (“Spark”), People Media, Inc. (“People Media”), Facebook, Inc. (“Facebook”), and Motorola Mobility Holdings LLC (“Motorola”) (collectively with Match, the “B.E. defendants”). A hearing on these motions will

(a) enable B.E. adequately to respond to the arguments and evidence presented by the B.E. defendants' reply memoranda, and (b) provide the Court a forum to ask any questions it may have before deciding these important motions.

**MEMORANDUM**

The arguments in favor of conducting a hearing on the B.E. defendant's motions to transfer are set forth in the memorandum supporting the motion for oral argument filed in *B.E. Technology L.L.C. v. Google, Inc.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-02830 JPM tmp. B.E. hereby incorporates by reference that document to avoid repeating duplicative information.

**CERTIFICATE OF CONSULATION**

Richard M. Carter, counsel for B.E., consulted telephonically with counsel for Match, Jonathan D. Rose, who stated that Match does not oppose a motion for oral argument so long as B.E. does not attempt to set time constraints on the parties. B.E. makes no request as to the format and structure of any hearing.

Dated: March 18, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

*s/Daniel J. Weinberg*

Robert E. Freitas (CA Bar No. 80948)  
Craig R. Kaufman (CA Bar No. 159458)  
Daniel J. Weinberg (CA Bar No. 227159)  
James Lin (CA Bar No. 241472)  
Qudus B. Olaniran (CA Bar No. 267838)  
FREITAS TSENG & KAUFMAN LLP  
100 Marine Parkway, Suite 200  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 593-6300  
Facsimile: (650) 593-6301  
rfreitas@ftklaw.com  
ckaufman@ftklaw.com  
dweinberg@ftklaw.com  
jlin@ftklaw.com  
qolaniran@ftklaw.com

Richard M. Carter (TN B.P.R. #7285)  
Adam C. Simpson (TN B.P.R. #24705)  
MARTIN, TATE, MORROW & MARSTON, P.C.  
6410 Poplar Avenue, Suite 1000  
Memphis, TN 38119-4839  
Telephone: (901) 522-9000  
Facsimile: (901) 527-3746  
rcarter@martintate.com  
asimpson@martintate.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff B.E. Technology, L.L.C.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on March 18, 2013 a true and correct copy of the foregoing was electronically filed with the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee and was served on counsel by the Court's electronic filing notification.

*s/Daniel J. Weinberg* \_\_\_\_\_

Daniel J. Weinberg