

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

VOIP-PAL.COM, INC.,

Plaintiff

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC.,
AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC, and
AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 6:20-cv-00272-ADA

**AMAZON'S OPPOSITION TO VOIP-PAL'S MOTION TO STRIKE OR
CONDUCT VENUE DISCOVERY AND FILE A SUR-REPLY TO AMAZON'S
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. AMAZON’S REPLY ARGUMENTS AND DECLARATIONS DIRECTLY RESPOND TO VOIP-PAL’S OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS. 2

 A. Amazon Properly Responded to VoIP-Pal’s Misrepresentations of Tim Thompson’s Prior Declaration Testimony..... 2

 B. Vinod Prasad’s Declaration and Amazon’s Arguments Related to That Declaration Properly Responded to VoIP-Pal’s Opposition Arguments..... 4

III. VOIP-PAL’S REQUEST FOR VENUE DISCOVERY AND A SUR-REPLY SHOULD BE DENIED. 6

IV. CONCLUSION..... 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE(S)
<i>Avery v. Colvin</i> , 605 F. App'x 278 (5th Cir. 2015)	2
<i>C&M Oilfield Rentals, LLC v. Location Illuminator Techs., LLC</i> , No. PE:18-CV-00039-DC-DF, 2020 WL 4708714 (W.D. Tex. July 13, 2020).....	2
<i>Calvasina v. Wal-Mart Real Estate Bus. Tr.</i> , 899 F. Supp. 2d 590 (W.D. Tex. 2012).....	6
<i>Gillaspy v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.</i> , 278 F. App'x 307 (5th Cir. 2008)	6
<i>Horak v. Glazer's Wholesale Drug Co.</i> , No. 06-10854, 2007 WL 713154 (5th Cir. Mar. 6, 2007).....	2
<i>MV3 Partners, LLC v. Roku, Inc.</i> , No. 6:18-cv-00308-ADA (W.D. Tex.).....	7

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite VoIP-Pal's repeated assertions that Amazon raised "new arguments" and submitted "new evidence" in its Reply in support of its Motion to Transfer ("Reply" (Dkt. No. 41)), nothing in Amazon's Reply was new. Amazon's position is, and has always been, that it has no relevant witnesses in this District because none of its employees in the District worked on the accused calling and messaging functionality. In response, VoIP-Pal injected two Austin-based Amazon employees into the case, Tim Thompson and Bala Kumar, by misrepresenting the substance of a declaration signed by Mr. Thompson and submitted in a different case. VoIP-Pal's opposition to Amazon's Motion to Transfer also made misleading arguments about the size of Amazon's presence in Austin, claimed a need for discovery on a "contact list" feature that VoIP-Pal speculated was developed in Austin, and asserted that Amazon provided insufficient evidence about its employees within the Northern District of California who worked on the accused functionality. Amazon responded to all of these arguments in its Reply and included declarations that addressed each issue raised by VoIP-Pal. Accordingly, VoIP-Pal's motion to strike Amazon's Reply arguments and declarations should be denied because they all properly respond to VoIP-Pal's arguments.

VoIP-Pal's alternative request for venue discovery and a sur-reply should also be denied. VoIP-Pal represented to this Court and Amazon that it did not need venue discovery from Amazon, that briefing on Amazon's Motion to Transfer would be closed with the filing of Amazon's Reply, and that the Motion should be decided without delay. (Aug. 7, 2020 Hearing Tr. at 38:22-39:10.) VoIP-Pal was well-aware of Amazon's positions when it made these representations because VoIP-Pal was already in possession of Amazon's Motion to Transfer and Mr. Thompson's prior declaration. Because Amazon's Reply arguments and declarations added nothing new, VoIP-Pal

should be held to its decision to waive venue discovery from Amazon and the Court should decide Amazon's Motion to Transfer without delay.

II. AMAZON'S REPLY ARGUMENTS AND DECLARATIONS DIRECTLY RESPOND TO VOIP-PAL'S OPPOSITION ARGUMENTS.

Although courts in this Circuit generally “decline to consider arguments made for the first time in a reply brief,” arguments “made in response to an argument in the [opposing party's] brief” are properly within the scope of reply. *Avery v. Colvin*, 605 F. App'x 278, 283-84 (5th Cir. 2015) (concluding that “an appellant's rebuttal in its reply brief of an argument made by an appellee in its brief” was proper where the appellee “is the one who injected the matter”). *See also Horak v. Glazer's Wholesale Drug Co.*, No. 06-10854, 2007 WL 713154, at *4 n.3 (5th Cir. Mar. 6, 2007) (“theory was properly before the district court” where the appellant “asserted the ... theory in his response brief” and the appellee “addressed the theory in its reply brief”). Declarations in support of arguments made in reply briefs that respond to the opposing party's arguments are likewise proper reply evidence. *C&M Oilfield Rentals, LLC v. Location Illuminator Techs., LLC*, No. PE:18-CV-00039-DC-DF, 2020 WL 4708714, at *2 (W.D. Tex. July 13, 2020) (“As the ‘new arguments’ that [defendant] seeks to strike are simply rebuttals to evidence that [defendant] *itself* introduced, the Court finds that [plaintiff] properly included the [witness] declarations. Accordingly, the declarations shall not be stricken on this ground.”).

Here, the arguments and declarations that VoIP-Pal seeks to strike are well within the scope of reply because they directly respond to arguments made in VoIP-Pal's Opposition to Amazon's Motion to Transfer (“Opp.” (Dkt. No. 33)).

A. Amazon Properly Responded to VoIP-Pal's Misrepresentations of Tim Thompson's Prior Declaration Testimony.

In its Motion to Transfer, Amazon specifically explained that there are no Amazon employees within the Western District of Texas who designed, developed, managed, or otherwise

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.