

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1

Plaintiff,

vs.

Intel Corporation

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-00676-RWS-RSP

**INTEL'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, TO TRANSFER TO THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Introduction..... 1**
- II. Background ..... 2**
  - A. Godo Kaisha and the Asserted Patents Are Based in Japan, Not Texas..... 2
  - B. Intel and the Accused Technologies Are Based in Oregon, Not Texas ..... 3
  - C. Third-Party Witnesses Are Based in Oregon, Not Texas ..... 6
- III. Legal Standard ..... 6**
- IV. Argument..... 7**
  - A. Venue Is Improper under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)..... 8
  - B. In the Alternative, the Convenience of the Parties and Witnesses and the Interests of Justice Compel Transfer of this Case to the District of Oregon ..... 10
    - 1. Godo Kaisha Could Have Filed This Case in the District of Oregon..... 11
    - 2. The Private-Interest Factors Heavily Favor Transfer to Oregon. .... 11
      - a. The sources of proof for this case are in or near Oregon..... 11
      - b. No compulsory process exists over relevant third-party witnesses in this District. .... 12
      - c. Costs and burdens for willing witnesses are significantly less in Oregon than this District..... 13
      - d. No practical concerns outweigh the convenience of transfer to Oregon. .... 14
    - 3. The Public-Interest Factors Favor Transfer to Oregon ..... 15
      - a. Oregon has a strong local interest in this case. .... 15
      - b. The remaining public-interest factors are neutral. .... 15
- V. Conclusion ..... 15**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Battee v. Ben E. Keith Co.</i> , No. 17-0161, 2017 WL 1832043 (E.D. Tex. May 5, 2017).....	14
<i>Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Mylan Pharms.</i> , No. 17-379, 2017 WL 3980155 (D. Del. Sept. 11, 2017).....	9
<i>Cannon Mfg. Co. v. Cudahy Packing Co.</i> , 267 U.S. 333 (1925).....	8
<i>Deep Green Wireless, LLC. v. Ooma, Inc.</i> , No. 16-604, 2017 WL 679643 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2017).....	13, 14
<i>Freudensprung v. Offshore Tech. Servs., Inc.</i> , 379 F.3d 327 (5th Cir. 2004) .....	8
<i>Godo Kaisha IP Bridge 1 v. Broadcom Ltd.</i> , No. 16-134 .....	2, 13, 14
<i>Hutchinson v. Tex. Historical Comm'n</i> , No. 11-65, 2011 WL 6181601 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 12, 2011), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , 2011 WL 6181262 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 12, 2011) .....	15
<i>In re Cray Inc.</i> , 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	7, 8, 9
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	12, 15
<i>In re Google Inc.</i> , No. 2017-107, 2017 WL 977038 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 23, 2017) .....	14
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>In re Nintendo Co.</i> , 589 F.3d 1194 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	10, 11, 15
<i>In re TS Tech. Corp.</i> , 551 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	12
<i>In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) .....	7, 13

*In re Zimmer Holdings, Inc.*,  
609 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....14

*Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington*,  
326 U.S. 310 (1945).....11

*LoganTree LP v. Garmin Int’l, Inc.*,  
No. 17-098, 2017 WL 2842870 (W.D. Tex. June 22, 2017) .....9

*Network-1 Sec. Sols., Inc. v. D-Link Corp.*,  
433 F. Supp. 2d 795 (E.D. Tex. 2006).....12

*On Semiconductor Corp. v. Hynix Semiconductor, Inc.*,  
No. 09-390, 2010 WL 3855520 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2010).....12

*Phillips v. Baker*,  
121 F.2d 752 (9th Cir. 1941) .....8

*Robinson v. Harley-Davidson Motor Co.*,  
316 P.3d 287 (Or. 2013) .....11

*Soverain IP, LLC v. AT&T, Inc.*,  
No. 17-293, 2017 WL 5126158 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 31, 2017) .....8

*TC Heartland LLC v. Kraft Foods Grp. Brands LLC*,  
137 S. Ct. 1514 (2017).....6

*Voxpath RS, LLC v. LG Elecs. U.S.A., Inc.*,  
No. 10-160, 2012 WL 194370 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2012).....14

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. §§.....7

28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a) .....11

28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) ..... *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) .....2, 7, 14

28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) .....7

35 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*.....11

**Other Authorities**

U.S. Patent Nos. 5,953,635 .....6

U.S. Patent Nos. 6,649,515 .....6

**TABLE OF EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit 1</b>	IP Bridge, Inc., <i>What We Do</i> (retrieved Nov. 15, 2017)
<b>Exhibit 2</b>	Texas Secretary of State Business Organizations Inquiry (“IP Bridge”)
<b>Exhibit 3</b>	Texas Secretary of State Business Organizations Inquiry (“Godo Kaisha IP Bridge”)
<b>Exhibit 4</b>	Texas Accurint Property Deeds (“Godo Kaisha IP Bridge”)
<b>Exhibit 5</b>	Orbis, LinkedIn, and Facebook Profiles for Godo Kaisha Employees
<b>Exhibit 6</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,602,802 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 7</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,197,696 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 8</b>	U.S. Patent No. RE41980 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 9</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,279,727 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 10</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,709,950 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 11</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,967,409 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 12</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,346,736 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 13</b>	U.S. Patent No. 7,800,165 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 14</b>	U.S. Patent No. 6,387,824 USPTO Assignment
<b>Exhibit 15</b>	Panasonic Corp., <i>Company Overview</i> (retrieved Nov. 15, 2017)
<b>Exhibit 16</b>	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) Filings for Inventors of the Patents-in-Suit
<b>Exhibit 17</b>	’696 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 18</b>	’980 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 19</b>	’727 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 20</b>	’950 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 21</b>	’409 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 22</b>	’736 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 23</b>	’165 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles
<b>Exhibit 24</b>	’824 Patent Prosecuting Attorneys Practitioner Registration Profiles

# 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.