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

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC	§	
	§	CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00072-JRG
v.	§	(Lead Case)
	§	
T-MOBILE USA, INC., and T-MOBILE	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
US, INC.	§	
	§	
	§	
AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC	§	
	§	CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00024-JRG
V.	8	(Member Case)
	§	,
LYFT, INC.	Š	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
,	8	
	U	

DEFENDANT LYFT, INC.'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND OBJECTIONS TO THE ORDER RECOMMENDING GRANT OF LYFT, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR IMPROPER VENUE (DKT. 212)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

				Page		
I.	INTI	RODU	CTION	1		
II.	ARG	SUMEN	NT	2		
	A. The Hertz Agreement Does Not Establish that Lyft Had a Regular and Established Place of Business in this District When This Case was Filed					
	B.		IS's Allegations Regarding Lyft's Partnerships are Insufficient to Suue in this District.	1 1		
	C.		missal is Warranted Because the Record Does Not Establish the "Moropriate Other Venue"			
		a.	Relative Ease of Access to Sources of Proof	10		
		b.	Availability of Compulsory Process to Secure the Attendance of Witne	esses11		
		c.	Cost of Willing Witnesses	12		
		d.	Substantial Local Interest	13		
		e.	Court Congestion	14		
III.	CON	ICLUS	ION	14		

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page
CASES
AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Apple, Inc., No. 2:17-CV-00516-JRG, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94947 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2018)1
Ikorongo Texas LLC et al. v. Lyft, Inc., 6-20-cv-00258 (W.D. Tex. July 7, 2021)
Ikorongo Texas LLC et al. v. Lyft, Inc., 6-20-cv-00258 (W.D. Tex. Sep. 1, 2021)
In re Acer Am. Corp., 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010)1
In re Adobe, 823 F. App'x (Fed. Cir. 2020)1
In re Apple Inc., 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020)
In re Cray, 871 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 2017)
In re Genentech, Inc., 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009)
In re Samsung Elecs. Co., Nos. 2021-139, 2021 WL 2672136 (Fed. Cir. June 30, 2021)
In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc., 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008)
In re ZTE (USA) Inc., 890 F.3d 1008, 1015 (Fed. Cir. 2018)
Pers. Audio, LLC v. Google, Inc., 280 F. Supp. 3d 922 (E.D. Tex. 2017)
Quartz Auto Techs. LLC v. Lyft, Inc., No. 1:20-CV-00719-ADA, 2021 WL 1177886 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 29, 2021)
STATUTES
28 U.S.C. § 1400(b)2,

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)	9
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)	9
Fed R Civ P 45(c)(1)	11

I. INTRODUCTION

AGIS Software Development LLC's ("AGIS") request for reconsideration and objections ("Motion") rehash the same arguments previously considered by Judge Payne in his well-reasoned Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 212) (hereinafter, "Report and Recommendation"). AGIS makes three arguments, none of which warrant deviation from Judge Payne's recommendation to dismiss this case.

First, contrary to sworn testimony and the evidence already considered by Judge Payne, AGIS incorrectly argues that the Hertz agreement "establishes that Lyft had a regular and established place of business in the District at the time the Complaint was filed." Dkt. 258 at 1. It does not. And AGIS has not, and cannot, provide any evidence contradicting sworn testimony that no such place existed at any time around or after AGIS filed its Complaint. There is little doubt that if Lyft operated an Express Drive location in this District, AGIS would have provided photos, testimony, and other evidence confirming it. AGIS provided no such evidence because it cannot; Lyft does not have a regular and established place of business in this District.

Second, based on attorney argument alone, AGIS incorrectly argues that payments to third-party airports, cities, jurisdictions, or municipalities should support a finding that Lyft has a regular and established place of business in the District. *See id.* at 1 & 8-10. Such arguments are legally flawed, directly contradict Federal Circuit precedent, and are not relevant to the venue inquiry—namely, whether Lyft operates a regular and established place of business at third-party sites.

Lastly, AGIS argues that the Court should transfer this case to a district previously found inappropriate for Lyft—rather than dismiss—based on the record Judge Payne already found inadequate to support transfer. Consistent with Judge Payne's Report and Recommendation, there is insufficient evidence to support transfer. Furthermore, AGIS failed to rebut Lyft's evidence that transfer would be inappropriate as confirmed by previous W.D. Tex. court orders finding the

DOCKET

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.

