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

AGIS Software Development, LLC,	)	
	)	Case No. 2:17-CV-00517-JRG
***Plaintiff*,**	)	
v.	)	
ZTE CORPORATION,	)	
ZTE (USA) INC.,	)	
ZTE (TX), INC.	)	
***Defendants*.**	)	

DEFENDANTS ZTE (TX) INC.'S AND ZTE (USA) INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR 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 FILED SUIT IN AN IMPROPER VENUE 1

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY: AGIS CANNOT ESTABLISH VENUE 1

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND: AGIS FILED SUIT IN AN IMPROPER VENUE 3

A. Plaintiff AGIS 3

B. Defendant ZTE (TX) Inc. 3

C. Defendant ZTE (USA) Inc. 4

IV. STATEMENT OF LAW 7

A. Venue In Patent Cases Can Only Exists If Each Defendant Resides Or Has A Regular And Established Place of Business In the Forum 7

1. Residency Of Defendants In Patent Cases Is Determined On A District-by-District Basis, Not A State-By-State Basis 8

2. Venue Over Non-Resident Defendants Requires A Regular And Established Place Of Business In The Forum 11

V. ARGUMENT: THE AMENDED COMPLAINT SHOULD BE DISMISSED 12

A. The Amended Complaint Should Be Dismissed For Improper Venue 13

1. Venue is Improper Under the First Prong of 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) 14

a. ZTA Does Not Reside In This District. 14

b. ZTX Does Not Reside In This District. 14

2. Venue is Improper for the Defendants under the Second Prong of 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) 15

a. ZTX has not Committed Acts of Infringement in the District and Does not Maintain A Regular And Established Place Of Business In This District 15

b. ZTA Does not Maintain A Regular And Established Place Of Business In This District 17

B. Should The Court Not Dismiss This Case, It Should Be Transferred To The Northern District of California 20

1. The Private Interest Factors Favor Transfer To The Northern District of California Or The Western District of Texas 22

a. The Relative Ease of Access To Sources of Proof Strongly Favors Transfer 22

b. The Availability Of Compulsory Process Favors Transfer..... 25

c. The Cost of Attendance For Willing Witnesses Favors Transfer 26

d. The Remaining Private Interest Factor Is Neutral. 28

2. The Public Interest Factors Favor Transfer To California..... 28

a. The Northern District Of California Has A Substantial Connection To and Local Interest In Adjudicating This Case..... 28

b. Administrative Difficulty From Court Congestion Is Neutral..... 29

c. The Remaining Public Interest Factors Are Neutral..... 30

VI. CONCLUSION: THIS CASE SHOULD BE DISMISSED OR TRANSFERRED 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Accord "A" Co. v. Consyne Corp.,
191 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 126 (S.D.CA 1975) 9

Action Commun. Sys. v. Datapoint Corp.,
426 F.Supp. 973 (N.D.TX. 1977) 10, 14, 15

In re Apple, Inc.,
456 Fed. Appx. 907, 2012 WL 112893 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 25

Blue Spike, LLC v. Caterpillar, Inc.,
6:16-CV-01361, 2017 WL 4129321 (E.D. TX Sep. 9, 2017) 8, 10, 13

Blue Spike, LLC v. Nook Digital, LLC, No. 6:16-CV-1361-RWS-JDL, 2017 WL 3263871 (E.D. Tex. July 28, 2017), report and recommendation adopted sub nom. *Blue Spike, LLC v. Caterpillar, Inc.*, No. 6:16-CV-01361-RWS, 2017 WL 4129321 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 19, 2017) 10

BNSF Ry. Co. v. Tyrrell,
137 S. Ct. 1549 (2017) 10

California Irrigation Services, Inc. v. Bartron Corp.,
654 F. Supp. 1, 227 USPQ 414 (N.D. Calif. 1985) 9

In re Cray,
871 F.3d 1355, No. 2017-129 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 21, 2017) ..... *passim*

Denver & R. G. W. R. Co. v. Bhd. of R. R. Trainmen,
387 U.S. 556 (1967) 10

Diem LLC v. BigCommerce, Inc., No. 6:17-cv-00186-JRG, 2017 WL 3187473, (E.D. Tex. July 26, 2017) 10

DSS Tech. Management, Inc. v. Apple, Inc.,
No. 13-cv-00919, 2014 WL 6847569 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2014) 28

Elbit Sys. Land & C4I Ltd. v. Hughes Network Sys., LLC,
No. 2:15-CV-37-RWS-RSP, 2017 WL 2651618 (E.D. Tex. June 20, 2017), report and recommendation adopted, No. 2:15-CV-00037-RWS, 2017 WL 4693971 (E.D. Tex. July 31, 2017) 10

Fourco Glass Co. v. Transmirra Products Corp.,
353 U.S. 222 (1957).....9, 14, 15

Frederick v. Advanced Fin. Solutions, Inc.,
558 F. Supp. 2d 699 (E.D. Tex. 2007).....21

In re Genentech, Inc.,
566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....16, 22, 26, 29

Groupchatter, LLC v. Itron, Inc.,
No. 15-900, 2016 WL 2758480 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....25, 27

In re Hoffman-La Roche Inc.,
587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....28

Indus. Tech. Research Inst. v. LG Corp.,
No. 6:10-cv-628 LED-JDL, 2011 WL 10622246 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 29, 2011).....21, 29

Intelligent Automation Design, LLC v. Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc. et al.,
No. 5:16-cv-11-CMC (E.D. Tex. July 21, 2016).....25, 27, 29

Magnacoustics, Inc. v. Resonance Technology Co.,
No. 97–1247, 1997 WL 592863 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 25, 1997).....2, 7, 13, 20

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).....8

In re Microsoft Corporation,
630 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....21, 25, 29

Network Protection Scis., LLC v. Juniper Networks, Inc.,
No. 10-cv-00224, 2012 WL 194382 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2012).....21

In re Nintendo Co., Ltd.,
589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....22, 26, 28

Portsmouth Baseball Corp v. Frick,
132 F. Supp. 922 (S.D.N.Y. 1955).....10

Samsonite Corp. v. Tex. Imperial Am., Inc.
218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 325 (N.D.TX. 1982).....10

Shaw v. Quincy Mining Co.,
145 U.S. 444 (1892).....8, 9, 15

Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Google, Inc.,
No. 07-cv-00511, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73972 (E.D. Tex. July 22, 2011).....29

DOCKET ALARM

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.