

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

AGIS Software Development, LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

ZTE CORPORATION AND  
ZTE (TX), INC.,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 2:17-CV-00517-JRG

**DEFENDANT ZTE (TX), INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT  
FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM AND IMPROPER VENUE OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE TO TRANSFER**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED BY THE COURT PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 7(a)(1)..... i

I. INTRODUCTION: AGIS SOFTWARE HAS SUED THE INCORRECT DEFENDANT IN AN IMPROPER VENUE..... 1

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: AGIS SOFTWARE CANNOT ESTABLISH VENUE..... 2

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND: AGIS SUED THE WRONG DEFENDANT IN THE WRONG VENUE ..... 3

    A. Plaintiff AGIS Software..... 3

    B. Defendant ZTE (TX) Inc. .... 3

IV. STATEMENT OF LAW..... 5

    A. The Complaint Must Plausibly Allege That The Defendant Can Infringe ..... 5

    B. Venue In Patent Cases Can Only Exist If Each Defendant Resides Or Has A Regular And Established Place of Business In the Forum..... 6

        1. Residency Of Defendants In Patent Cases Is Determined On A District-by-District Basis, Not A State-By-State Basis ..... 7

        2. Venue Over Non-Resident Defendants Requires A Regular And Established Place Of Business In The Forum..... 9

V. ARGUMENT: THE COMPLAINT SHOULD BE DISMISSED ..... 10

    A. The Complaint Should Be Dismissed For Failure To State A Claim ..... 11

        1. AGIS Software Fails To Allege Or Plead Facts Sufficient To Prove Direct Infringement By ZTX ..... 11

        2. AGIS Software Fails To Allege Or Plead Facts Sufficient To Prove Indirect Infringement By ZTX..... 13

    B. The Complaint Should Be Dismissed For Improper Venue ..... 14

        1. ZTX Does Not Reside In This District ..... 15

        2. ZTX Has Not Committed Acts Of Infringement In This District..... 16

        3. ZTX Does Not Maintain A Regular And Established Place Of Business In This District..... 17

C.	Should The Court Not Dismiss This Case, It Should Be Transferred To The Western District of Texas or the Northern District of California.....	19
1.	The Private Interest Factors Favor Transfer To The Northern District of California Or The Western District of Texas .....	21
a.	The Relative Ease of Access To Sources of Proof Strongly Favors Transfer .....	21
b.	The Availability Of Compulsory Process Favors Transfer.....	24
c.	The Cost of Attendance For Willing Witnesses Favors Transfer .....	24
d.	The Remaining Private Interest Factor Is Neutral. ....	26
2.	The Public Interest Factors Favor Transfer To California.....	26
a.	The Northern District Of California Has A Substantial Connection To and Local Interest In Adjudicating This Case.....	26
b.	Administrative Difficulty From Court Congestion Is Neutral.....	27
c.	The Remaining Public Interest Factors Are Neutral.....	27
VI.	CONCLUSION: THIS CASE SHOULD BE DISMISSED OR TRANSFERRED .....	28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>“A” Co. v. Consyne Corp.</i> , 191 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 126 (S.D.CA 1975).....	8
<i>Action Commun. Sys. v. Datapoint Corp.</i> , 426 F.Supp. 973 (N.D. Tex. 1977) .....	8, 15, 16
<i>American GNC Corp. v. ZTE Corp.</i> , 2:17-CV-00107 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 5, 2017).....	28
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , 456 Fed.Appx. 907, 2012 WL 112893 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	23
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	5, 6, 10, 14
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	5, 6, 10, 12
<i>In re Bill of Lading Transmission &amp; Processing Sys. Patent Litig.</i> , 681 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	5, 12
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Caterpillar, Inc.</i> , 6:16-CV-01361, 2017 WL 4129321 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 9, 2017).....	7, 14
<i>Bowlby v. City of Aberdeen</i> , 681 F.3d 215 (5th Cir. 2012) .....	6
<i>California Irrigation Services, Inc. v. Bartron Corp.</i> , 654 F. Supp. 1, 227 U.S.P.Q. 414 (N.D. Cal. 1985).....	8
<i>City of Clinton, Ark. v. Pilgrim's Pride Corp.</i> , 632 F.3d 148 (5th Cir. 2010) .....	5
<i>In re Cray</i> , ___ F.3d ___, No. 2017-129 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 21, 2017) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>DSS Tech. Management, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-00919, 2014 WL 6847569 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2014).....	25
<i>DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006) ( <i>en banc</i> ) .....	13

*Ferrer v. Chevron Corp.*,  
484 F.3d 776 (5th Cir. 2007) .....16

*Fourco Glass Co. v. Transmirra Products Corp.*,  
353 U.S. 222 (1957).....8, 15

*Frederick v. Advanced Fin. Solutions, Inc.*,  
558 F.Supp.2d 699 (E.D. Tex. 2007) .....19

*In re Genentech, Inc.*,  
566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009)..... *passim*

*Groupchatter, LLC v. Itron, Inc.*,  
No. 15-900, 2016 WL 2758480 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....22, 24

*In re Hoffman-La Roche Inc.*,  
587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....26

*Imation Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips Elecs. N.V.*,  
586 F.3d 980 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....6

*Indus. Tech. Research Inst. v. LG Corp.*,  
No. 6:10-cv-628 LED-JDL, 2011 WL 10622246 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 29, 2011).....19, 27

*Intelligent Automation Design, LLC v. Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc. et al.*,  
No. 5:16-cv-11-CMC, 2016 WL 4424967 (E.D. Tex. July 21, 2016).....22, 24, 27

*LBS Innovations, LLC v. Nokia USA, Inc. et al.*,  
No. 2:15-cv-1972, 2016 WL 3407611 (E D. Tex. June 21, 2016) .....6

*M2M Solutions LLC v. Telit Communs. PLC*,  
2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102349 (D. Del. 2015) .....11

*Macronix Int’l Co. v. Spansion Inc.*,  
4 F.Supp.3d 797 (E.D. Va. 2014) .....12

*Magnacoustics, Inc. v. Resonance Technology Co.*,  
No. 97–1247, 1997 WL 592863 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 25, 1997).....2, 6, 14

*McZeal v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*,  
501 F.3d 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....6

*Melvin Lloyd Co. v. Stonite Products Co.*,  
119 F.2d 883 (3d Cir. 1941), *rev’d Stonite Products Co. v. Melvin Lloyd Co.*,  
315 U.S. 561 (1942).....7

*In re Microsoft Corporation*,  
630 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....20, 23, 26

# 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.