

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

RFCYBER CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 6:21-cv-00916-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Plaintiff RFCyber Corp. (“RFCyber”) respectfully submits this Notice of Supplemental Authority to the Court regarding Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) Motion for Intra-District Transfer to the Austin Division. Dkt. 93.

On October 31, 2022, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit denied a Petition seeking a Writ of Mandamus ordering the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to transfer a case to the Western District of Texas. *In re Planned Parenthood Fed’n of Am., Inc.*, 52 F.4th 625(5th Cir. 2022). The Fifth Circuit held that Petitioners failed to show a clear and undisputable right to the writ where the record “falls well short of establishing that the destination venue is clearly more convenient than Respondents’ chosen venue.” *Id.* at 630.

Specifically, the Fifth Circuit found that the private and public interest factors did not compel transfer:

- As to the location of evidence, the Court held: “[t]he location of evidence bears much more strongly on the transfer analysis when . . . the evidence is physical in nature.” *Id.* Since “the vast majority of the evidence was electronic, and therefore equally accessible in either forum,” and “[t]here was some remaining documentary evidence in both the Northern District and the Western District,” the factor weighed against transfer. *Id.* Similarly, in this case, the vast majority of Apple’s evidence is electronic, and Apple has identified no physical evidence whatsoever located in Austin. Dkt. 93 at 10; Dkt. 102 at 11-12. Conversely, RFCyber’s documents are located in Waco. Dkt. 102 at 11-12.
- “As to the availability of compulsory process, the district court found that this factor did not weigh in favor of transfer because the *Petitioners failed to identify any witnesses who would be unwilling to testify.*” *Planned Parenthood*, 52 F.4th at

630. (emphasis added). Here, Apple admits that it has identified no witnesses who are unwilling to testify. Dkt. 93 at 11.

- “As to the cost of attendance for willing witnesses, the relevant witnesses reside across the state and across the country. . . . In light of this fact, the parties spar over whether it would be cheaper for the witnesses to travel to Austin or Amarillo. The district court acknowledged these arguments, finding that there are more flights into Austin, but that other[] costs in Amarillo are less—such as hotels and restaurants.” *Planned Parenthood*, 52 F.4th at 631. Here, the parties proposed competing concerns as to witness attendance, but it was undisputed that many of Apple’s witnesses would have to travel regardless of the ultimate venue, and that RFCyber had an office it could utilize in Waco. Dkt. 102 at 12-13.
- As to local interests, “the defendants and the witnesses are located across the state and across the country. We agree that this is not the sort of localized case where the citizens of Austin have a greater ‘stake’ in the litigation than the citizens of Amarillo.” *Planned Parenthood*, 52 F.4th at 632. Here, Apple is a national company with offices across the country. While it has a large office in Austin (the importance of which it sought to minimize in its withdrawn Motion for Inter-District Transfer), this patent infringement case is not a “localized case where the citizens of Austin have a greater ‘stake’ in the litigation than” those of Waco. *Id.*
- As to court congestion, “[t]o the extent docket efficiency can be reliably estimated, the district court is better placed to do so than this court. Moreover, this case appears to be timely proceeding to trial before the Amarillo Division. That fact further counsels against transfer.” *Id.* at 631. Similarly, the case is proceeding in a timely

fashion in this Division, with claim construction already completed and fact discovery scheduled to close on January 17, 2023. Dkt. 29 at 3. Apple merely speculates otherwise. Dkt. 105 at 4.

Finally, the Fifth Circuit noted that “Petitioners’ failure to seek relief until late in the litigation weighed against transfer.” *Planned Parenthood*, 52 F.4th at 631. In particular, the Petitioners waited until seven months after the case was unsealed, and after they had lost a motion to dismiss and for reconsideration. *Id.* Similarly here, Apple waited to file its motion until eight months after the beginning of claim construction proceedings, and months after it filed its doomed motion to transfer to the Northern District of California. Apple’s untimeliness further weighs against its motion to transfer. Dkt. 102 at 6-10.

Dated: December 8, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Vincent J. Rubino, III

Raymond W. Mort, III
Texas State Bar No. 00791308
Email: raymort@austinlaw.com
THE MORT LAW FIRM, PLLC
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 2000
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel/Fax: 512-865-7950

OF COUNSEL:

Alfred R. Fabricant (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
NY Bar No. 2219392
Email: ffabricant@fabricantllp.com
Peter Lambrianakos (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
NY Bar No. 2894392
Email: plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com
Vincent J. Rubino, III (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
NY Bar No. 4557435
Email: vrubino@fabricantllp.com
Richard M. Cowell (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
NY Bar No. 4617759
Email: rcowell@fabricantllp.com
FABRICANT LLP

411 Theodore Fremd Avenue,
Suite 206 South
Rye, New York 10580
Telephone: (212) 257-5797
Facsimile: (212) 257-5796

***ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
RFCYBER CORP.***

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.