

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION

BANDSPEED, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

C.A. No. 1:20-cv-00765-LY

**DEFENDANT REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.'S
RULE 12 MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. Procedural History	2
B. Bandspeed’s Complaint Includes Insufficient Jurisdictional Allegations.	2
C. Realtek Lacks Contacts with, and Does Not Purposefully Direct Any Conduct Towards, Texas.	3
III. THIS COURT LACKS PERSONAL JURISDICTION OVER REALTEK	4
A. Legal Standard	4
B. Realtek is Not Subject to General Jurisdiction in This District.	6
C. Realtek is Not Subject to Specific Jurisdiction in This District.....	6
1. Bandspeed’s claims do not arise out of any activities of Realtek that are purposefully directed at Texas.	7
2. Specific jurisdiction over Realtek does not exist under the stream-of- commerce theory.....	10
3. Asserting personal jurisdiction over Realtek would be unreasonable and unfair.	12
D. Realtek is Not Subject to Federal Long-Arm Jurisdiction under Rule 4(k)(2).....	14
IV. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS BANDSPEED’S COMPLAINT BECAUSE IT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR RELIEF.....	15
A. Legal Standard	15
B. Bandspeed’s Complaint Pleads No Plausible Acts of Realtek in the U.S. That May Constitute Direct Infringement.....	16
C. This Court Should Dismiss Bandspeed’s Claims of Direct Infringement of the Three Patents Where Only Method Claims are Asserted.	17
V. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS BANDSPEED’S COMPLAINT BECAUSE OF ITS FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND ITS INEXPLICABLE DELAY IN EFFECTING SERVICE	18
A. Bandspeed’s Complaint Should be Dismissed because Bandspeed Failed to Exercise Due Diligence in Attempting Service	18
B. Bandspeed’s Complaint Should be Dismissed Under Rule 41(b) Based on Bandspeed’s Failure to Prosecute	19
VI. CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>10x Genomics, Inc. v. Celsee, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 5595666 (D. Del. Oct. 30, 2019), <i>adopting recommendation</i> 2019 WL 6037558 (D. Del. Nov. 14, 2019)	18
<i>AFTG-TG, LLC v. Nuvoton Tech. Corp.</i> , 689 F.3d 1358, 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	6, 11
<i>APS Technology, Inc. v. Vertex Downhole, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 4346700 (D. Del. July 29, 2020)	18
<i>Asahi Metal Indus. Co. v. Super. Ct.</i> , 480 U.S. 102 (1987).....	10, 13, 14
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	15, 16
<i>Auto Wax Co. v. Kasei Kogyo Co.</i> , No. A 00-531 SS, 2001 WL 1891719 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2001)	13
<i>Autogenomics, Inc. v. Oxford Gene Tech. Ltd.</i> , 566 F.3d 1012 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	5
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	15, 16
<i>Beverly Hills Fan Co. v. Royal Sovereign Corp.</i> , 21 F.3d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1994).....	11, 13
<i>Blue Spike, LLC v. Texas Instruments, Inc.</i> , No. 12-cv-00499, 2014 WL 11829323 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 31, 2014)	7
<i>Breakall v. Munn</i> , No. A-08-CA-485-LY, 2008 WL 11417063 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 9, 2008).....	7
<i>Bullard v. Burlington N. Santa Fe Ry. Co.</i> , 368 Fed. Appx. 574 (5th Cir. 2010).....	20
<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i> , 471 U.S. 462 (1985).....	7, 13
<i>Celgard, LLC v. SK Innovation Co., Ltd.</i> , 792 F.3d 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	5, 6

<i>City of El Paso v. Soule</i> , 991 F. Supp. 812 (W.D. Tex. 1998).....	13
<i>Coleman v. Sweetin</i> , 745 F.3d 756 (5th Cir. 2014)	19
<i>Daimler AG v. Bauman</i> , 571 U.S. 117 (2014).....	6
<i>De La Vega v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , No. W-19-CV-00612-ADA, 2020 WL 3528411 (W.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2020).....	16
<i>Dillard v. Federal Corp.</i> , 321 F. Supp. 3d 752 (W.D. Tex. 2018).....	13
<i>Elecs. for Imaging Inc. v. Coyle</i> , 340 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	6
<i>Ericsson, Inc. v. D-Link Systems, Inc.</i> , 773 F.3d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	17
<i>Freescale Semi., Inc. v. Amtran Tech. Co.</i> , No. A-12-CV-644-LY, 2013 WL 12121034 (W.D. Tex. June 12, 2013)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Freudensprung v. Offshore Tech. Servs., Inc.</i> , 379 F.3d 327 (5th Cir. 2004)	7
<i>Garnet Digital, LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 893 F. Supp. 2d 814 (E.D. Tex. 2012).....	7
<i>Gomez v. Galman</i> , 18 F.4th 769 (5th Cir. 2021)	5, 14
<i>Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown</i> , 564 U.S. 915 (2011).....	10
<i>Hanson v. Denckla</i> , 357 U.S. 235 (1958).....	5
<i>i4i Ltd. P'ship v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 598 F.3d 831 (Fed. Cir. 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 564 U.S. 91 (2011)	17
<i>Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> , 326 U.S. 310 (1945).....	5, 9
<i>J. McIntyre Mach., Ltd. v. Nicastro</i> , 564 U.S. 873 (2011).....	10

<i>Johnston v. Multidata Sys. Int'l Corp.</i> , 523 F.3d 602 (5th Cir. 2008)	5, 6
<i>Joy Techs., Inc. v. Flakt, Inc.</i> , 6 F.3d 770 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	17
<i>Kajeet, Inc. v. Gryphon Online Safety, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 780737 (D. Del. March 1, 2021).....	18
<i>Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Zoll Medical Corp.</i> , 656 Fed. Appx. 504 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	18
<i>Lawson v. Aleutian Spray Fisheries Inc.</i> , No. C11-0061JLR, 2012 WL 208111 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 24, 2012).....	20
<i>Lozano v. Bosdet</i> , 693 F.3d 485 (5th Cir. 2012)	18
<i>Lucent Techs., Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	17
<i>Lyda v. CBS Corp.</i> , 838 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2016).....	17
<i>M-I Drilling Fluids UK Ltd. v. Dynamic Air Ltda.</i> , 890 F.3d 995 (Fed. Cir. 2018).....	12
<i>Med. Sols., Inc. v. C Change Surgical LLC</i> , 541 F.3d 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	5
<i>Merial Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd.</i> , 681 F.3d 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	14
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.</i> , 550 U.S. 437 (2007).....	16
<i>Moncrief Oil Int'l Inc. v. OAO Gazprom</i> , 481 F.3d 309 (5th Cir. 2007)	9
<i>Motion Games, LLC v. Nintendo Co.</i> , No. 6:12-cv-878-JDL, 2014 WL 5306961 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 16, 2014).....	14
<i>MWK Recruiting, Inc. v. Jowers</i> , No. 1:18-cv-444, 2019 WL 7761445 (W.D. Tex. July 29, 2019).....	5
<i>Nuance Commc'ns, Inc. v. Abby Software House</i> , 626 F.3d 1222 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	5, 6

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.