

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

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.; and ATI
TECHNOLOGIES ULC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TCL INDUSTRIES HOLDINGS CO., LTD.; TCL
INDUSTRIES HOLDINGS (H.K.) LIMITED;
TCL ELECTRONICS HOLDINGS LIMITED;
TCL TECHNOLOGY GROUP CORPORATION;
TTE CORPORATION; TCL HOLDINGS (BVI)
LIMITED; TCL KING ELECTRICAL
APPLIANCES (HUIZHOU) CO. LTD.;
SHENZHEN TCL NEW TECHNOLOGIES CO.,
LTD.; TCL MOKA INTERNATIONAL
LIMITED; TCL SMART DEVICE (VIETNAM)
CO., LTD; MANUFACTURAS AVANZADAS
SA DE CV; TCL ELECTRONICS MEXICO, S
DE RL DE CV; TCL OVERSEAS MARKETING
LTD.; and REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR
CORP.,

Defendants.

C. A. NO. 2:22-CV-00134

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	1
A. Procedural History.	1
B. AMD’s Complaint Includes Only Conclusory and Insufficient Jurisdictional Allegations.	2
C. AMD Has Failed to Allege that Realtek Has Sufficient Contacts with, and Purposefully Directs Relevant Conduct Towards, Texas.	3
III. THIS COURT LACKS PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER REALTEK.	4
A. Legal Standard	4
B. Realtek is Not Subject to Federal Long-Arm Jurisdiction under Rule 4(k)(2).	5
C. Realtek is Not Subject to General Jurisdiction in This District.	6
D. Realtek is Not Subject to Specific Jurisdiction in This District.	7
1. AMD has not alleged any activities of Realtek that are purposefully directed at Texas.	7
2. AMD has also failed to plead facts supporting specific jurisdiction over Realtek under the stream-of-commerce theory.	10
3. Asserting personal jurisdiction over Realtek would be unreasonable and unfair.	15
E. Because the Factual Allegations of the Complaint Fail to Establish a Prima Facie Case of Personal Jurisdiction, AMD is Not Entitled to Jurisdictional Discovery	Error! Bookmark not defined.
IV. CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acceleron, LLC v. Egenera, Inc.</i> , 634 F. Supp. 2d 758 (E.D. Tex. 2009).....	7, 18
<i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , Case No. 14-cv-01012-SI, Dkt. No. 1 (N.D. Cal).....	17
<i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. et al v. MediaTek Inc. et al</i> , Case No. 1:19-cv-00070, Dkt. No. 1 (D. Del.)	17
<i>AFTG-TG, LLC v. Nuvoton Tech. Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	7, 11
<i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 2:17-CV-00514-JRG, 2018 WL 4680557 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 28, 2018)	17
<i>Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Super. Ct.</i> , 480 U.S. 102 (1987).....	11, 16, 17
<i>Autogenomics, Inc. v. Oxford Gene Tech. Ltd.</i> , 566 F.3d 1012 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	4
<i>Beverly Hills Fan Co. v. Royal Sovereign Corp.</i> , 21 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	11, 15
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Huawei Techs. Co., Ltd</i> , No. 6:13-CV-00679-RWS, 2016 WL 3951665 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2016).....	12
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Texas Instruments, Inc.</i> , No. 6:12-cv-00499, 2014 WL 11829323 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2014).....	7-10
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Texas Instruments, Inc.</i> , No. 6:12-CV-00499, 2014 WL 11858192 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 18, 2014)	4, 8
<i>Bluestone Innovations Texas, L.L.C. v. Formosa Epitaxy Inc.</i> , 822 F. Supp. 2d 657 (E.D. Tex. 2011).....	6
<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462, 477 (1985).....	15
<i>Celgard, LLC v. SK Innovation Co., Ltd.</i> , 792 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	4, 18

..

City of El Paso v. Soule,
991 F. Supp. 812 (W.D. Tex. 1998).....16

Daimler AG v. Bauman,
571 U.S. 117 (2014).....6

Dillard v. Federal Corp.
321 F. Supp. 3d 752, 761 (W.D. Tex. 2018).....16

Elecs. for Imaging Inc. v. Coyle,
340 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....7

Fellowship Filtering Techs., LLC v. Alibaba.com, Inc.,
No. 2:15-CV-2049-JRG, 2016 WL 6917272 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 1, 2016)4, 18

Freescal Semiconductor, Inc. v. Amtran Tech. Co.,
No. A-12-CV-644-LY, 2014 WL 1603665 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 19, 2014)10, 14, 15

Freudensprung v. Offshore Tech. Servs., Inc.,
379 F.3d 327 (5th Cir. 2004)8

Future Link Systems, LLC v. Realtek Semiconductor Corp.,
No. 6:21-cv-003631, 3

Garnet Digital, LLC v. Apple, Inc.,
893 F. Supp. 2d 814 (E.D. Tex. 2012).....7, 10

Georgetown Rail Equip. Co. v. Tetra Tech Canada Inc.,
No. 6:18-CV-377-RWS-KNM, 2019 WL 5954966 (E.D. Tex. July 17, 2019).....5, 6

Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown,
564 U.S. 915 (2011).....11

Hanson v. Denckla,
357 U.S. 235 (1958).....5

Helicopteros Nacionales de Colombia, S.A. v. Hall,
466 U.S. 408 (1984).....6

Int’l Shoe Co. v. Washington,
326 U.S. 310 (1945).....5

ISI Intern., Inc. v. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP,
256 F.3d 548 (7th Cir. 2001)5

J. McIntyre Mach., Ltd. v. Nicastro,
564 U.S. 873 (2011).....11, 15

...

Johnston v. Multidata Sys. Int’l Corp.,
523 F.3d 602 (5th Cir. 2008)5, 6, 7

Largan Precision Co. v. Ability Opto-Elecs. Tech. Co.,
No. 4:19-CV-696, 2020 WL 569815 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 5, 2020).....13

M-I Drilling Fluids UK Ltd. v. Dynamic Air Ltda.,
890 F.3d 995 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....15

Med. Sols., Inc. v. C Change Surgical LLC,
541 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....5

Merial Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd.,
681 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....5

Moncrief Oil Int’l Inc. v. OAO Gazprom,
481 F.3d 309, 312 (5th Cir. 2007)9, 10

Motion Games, LLC v. Nintendo Co.,
No. 6:12-cv-878-JDL, 2014 WL 5306961 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2014).....18

Nuance Commc’ns, Inc. v. Abbyy Software House,
626 F.3d 1222 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....4, 7

Panda Brandywine Corp. v. Potomac Elec. Power Co.,
253 F.3d 865 (5th Cir. 2001) (per curiam).....4, 18

Nygaard v. Federation Internationale de L’Automobile,
No. 6:20-cv-234-ADA (W.D. Tex. July 15, 2021).....12

Pieczenik v. Dyax Corp.,
265 F.3d 1329,1334 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....4

Polar Electro Oy v. Suunto Oy,
829 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....4, 11

Red Wing Shoe Co. v. Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc.,
148 F.3d 1355 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....6

Revell v. Lidov,
317 F.3d 467 (5th Cir. 2002)9

Salter v. Upjohn Co.,
593 F.2d 649, 651 (5th Cir. 1979)18

Silicon Laboratories, Inc. v. Cresta Technology Corp.
No. A-14-CA-318-SS, 2014 WL 3530817 (W.D. Tex. July 14, 2014).....13, 14

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.