

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

SLYDE ANALYTICS LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZEPP HEALTH CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00172-RWS-RSP

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

**PLAINTIFF SLYDE ANALYTICS LLC'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION  
TO DEFENDANT ZEPP HEALTH CORPORATION'S MOTION  
TRANSFER VENUE TO THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (DKT. 11)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <b><u>Page(s)</u></b> |
|--|-----------------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....  | 1                     |
| II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED .....  | 1                     |
| III. BACKGROUND .....  | 2                     |
| A. Procedural Background.....  | 2                     |
| B. Slyde Analytics LLC.....  | 2                     |
| IV. LEGAL STANDARDS .....  | 3                     |
| A. Transfer Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).....   | 3                     |
| V. ARGUMENT.....   | 5                     |
| A. The Case Should Not be Transferred Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) .....                              | 5                     |
| 1. The Private Interest Factors Weigh Against Transfer.....  | 5                     |
| a. Availability of Compulsory Process to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses Does Not Favor Transfer..... | 5                     |
| b. Relative Ease of Access to Sources of Proof Weigh Against Transfer.....                               | 7                     |
| c. The Cost and Convenience of Attendance for Willing Witnesses Does Not Favor Transfer .....            | 10                    |
| d. All Other Practical Problems .....  | 12                    |
| 2. The Public Interest Factors Weigh Against Transfer.....   | 13                    |
| a. The Administrative Difficulties Flowing from Court Congestion Weigh Against Transfer.....             | 13                    |
| b. The Local-Interest Factor Weighs Against Transfer .....   | 13                    |
| VI. CONCLUSION.....  | 15                    |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****Cases**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:17-CV-00516-JRG, 2018 WL 2721826 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2018) .....              | 4, 12    |
| <i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. Huawei Device USA Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:17-CV-00513-JRG, 2018 WL 2329752 (E.D. Tex. May 23, 2018) .....   | 7        |
| <i>AGIS Software Dev. LLC v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> ,<br>Case No. 2:17-CV-00515, Dkt. 1 (E.D. Tex.) .....                               | 6        |
| <i>Aloft Media, LLC v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:07-CV-355, 2008 WL 819956 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 25, 2008) .....                      | 3, 4     |
| <i>In re Apple Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2018-151, Dkt. 20 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 16, 2018) .....   | 3        |
| <i>Core Wireless Licensing, S.A.R.L. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 6:12-CV-100 LED-JDL, 2013 WL 682849 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 22, 2013) ..... | 3, 8, 11 |
| <i>CXT Sys., Inc. v. Container Store, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:18-CV-00173-RWS-RSP, 2019 WL 1506015 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 5, 2019) .....        | 3, 12    |
| <i>Decapolis Sys., LLC v. eClinicalWorks, LLC</i> ,<br>No. 6:21-cv-00502, Dkt. No. 30 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 1, 2022) .....                 | 14       |
| <i>Def. Distr. v Bruck</i> ,<br>30 F.4th 414 (5th Cir. 2022) .....   | 6, 7, 9  |
| <i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> ,<br>566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009) .....   | 12       |
| <i>In re Google LLC</i> ,<br>No. 2021-178, 2021 WL 5292267 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 15, 2021) .....   | 8, 12    |
| <i>Hammers v. Mayea-Chang</i> ,<br>No. 2:19-CV-00181-JRG, 2019 WL 6728446 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 11, 2019) .....                            | 9        |
| <i>Kahn v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> ,<br>889 F.2d 1078 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....   | 3        |
| <i>LightGuide, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:22-CV-00443-RWS-RSP, 2023 WL 6780180 (E.D. Tex. 2023) .....                   | 6, 9     |

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| <i>Lonestar Biometrics LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,<br>Case No. 2:22-cv-00240, Dkt. 1 (E.D. Tex.) .....                       | 7        |
| <i>Longhorn HD LLC. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:21-CV-00099-JRG, 2021 WL 4243382 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2021) .....   | 13       |
| <i>NorthStar Sys. LLC v. Volkswagen AG</i> ,<br>Case No. 2:22-cv-00486,, Dkt. 1 (E.D. Tex.) .....                                | 10       |
| <i>Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. Flywheel Sports, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:18-CV-00390, 2019 WL 2303034 (E.D. Tex. May 30, 2019) ..... | 13       |
| <i>In re Planned Parenthood Fed'n of Am., Inc.</i> ,<br>52 F.4th (5th Cir. 2022) .....   | 5, 8, 10 |
| <i>Quest NetTech Corp. v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:19-CV-00118-JRG, 2019 WL 6344267 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 27, 2019).....             | 3        |
| <i>In re Radmax, Ltd.</i> ,<br>720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013) .....  | 7        |
| <i>Seasons USA, Inc. v. FUN World, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:22-cv-00416, 2023 WL 5511521 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 25, 2023).....               | 4, 13    |
| <i>Slyde Analytics LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,<br>Case No. 2:23-cv-00172, Dkt. 1 (E.D. Tex.) .....                           | 12       |
| <i>Stragent LLC v. Audi AG</i> ,<br>No. 6:10-CV-227-LED-JDL, 2011 WL 2912907 (E.D. Tex. July 18, 2011).....                      | 11       |
| <i>Utterback v. Trustmark Nat'l Bank</i> ,<br>716 F. App'x 241 (5th Cir. 2017) .....   | 8        |
| <i>In re Vistaprint, Ltd.</i> ,<br>628 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....   | 14       |
| <i>Vocalife LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> ,<br>No. 2:19-CV-00123-JRG, 2019 WL 6345191 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 27, 2019).....               | 11       |
| <i>In re Volkswagen AG</i> ,<br>371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004) .....   | 3, 4, 10 |
| <i>In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.</i> ,<br>545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) .....   | 3, 4, 7  |
| <b>Statutes</b>  |          |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) .....  | 3, 4     |

## I. INTRODUCTION

Slyde Analytics LLC (“Slyde” or “Plaintiff”) files this response to Defendant Zepp Health Corporation’s (“ZHC” or “Defendant”) motion to transfer venue to the Central District of California (“CDCA”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (Dkt. 11) (the “Motion”). The Motion should be denied because ZHC has failed to meet its burden to show that the CDCA is clearly more convenient for all parties and witnesses. Plaintiff Slyde is based in the Eastern District of Texas (“EDTX”), and has a significant presence in the EDTX, and therefore a strong local interest in having this case remain in this District. As set forth below, Slyde has identified sources of proof, as well as the convenience of its witnesses in the EDTX. Moreover, Slyde has identified numerous third parties with relevant information who may be subpoenaed in the EDTX and not the CDCA. The CDCA has no legitimate connection to this case. By its own admission, ZHC is a company whose business activities, personnel, and documents are almost entirely located *in China*. See Motion at 2. In the Motion, ZHC does not rely on its own activities in support of transfer, but rather relies on two speculative non-parties: Zepp, Inc. and Zepp North America, Inc. (“ZNA”) (collectively, “Zepp Entities”). Contrary to ZHC’s limited proofs in its Motion, ZHC does not have a strong presence in the CDCA, let alone a presence that could make it “clearly more convenient” than the EDTX. ZHC’s Motion is premised on incorrect and unsupported conclusions regarding Slyde’s presence in the EDTX. All the transfer factors either weigh against transfer or are neutral, and therefore the motion should be denied.

## II. RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Whether ZHC has met its burden to establish that the CDCA is clearly more convenient, where it has failed to sufficiently identify witnesses and documents in the CDCA that would warrant transfer, and where Slyde has shown relative ease to sources of proof in this District and has demonstrated a presence in this District with several witnesses (both compulsory and non-

# 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.