

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

ADVANCED SILICON  
TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

NXP SEMICONDUCTORS N.V.,  
NXP B.V., and  
NXP USA, INC.,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case. No. 6:22-CV-0466-ADA-DTG

**DEFENDANT NXP USA, INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS  
OPPOSED MOTION FOR INTRA-DISTRICT TRANSFER  
TO THE AUSTIN DIVISION OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>AlmondNet, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2022 WL 17574082 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2022).....	1, 3
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	4, 5
<i>Brazos River Auth. v. GE Ionics, Inc.</i> , 469 F.3d 416 (5th Cir. 2006) .....	4
<i>Corrino Holdings LLC v. Expedia, Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 1094621 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 12, 2022).....	2, 3
<i>DataScape, Ltd. v. Dell Techs., Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 4254069 (W.D. Tex. June 7, 2019) .....	1, 2, 4
<i>Freshub, Inc. v. Amazon.com Inc.</i> , 6:19-cv-388-ADA, Dkt. 29 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 2019) .....	1, 2
<i>Future Link Sys., LLC v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 6015535 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 18, 2021).....	4
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	2, 3
<i>In re Google LLC</i> , 2021 WL 4427899 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 27, 2021) .....	2
<i>Hammond Dev. Int'l, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 6136783 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2020) .....	1
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	5
<i>Identity Security LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 6:21-cv-00460-ADA, Dkt. 59 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2022) .....	1, 5
<i>Mc Asset Recovery, LLC v. Castex Energy, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 12171724 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 7, 2013) .....	4
<i>Neo Wireless, LLC v. Dell Techs. Inc.</i> , 6:21-cv-00024-ADA, Dkt. 60 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2022).....	1, 3

*ParkerVision, Inc. v. Intel Corp.*,  
2021 WL 401989 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 26, 2021) .....4

*Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
2022 WL 17420391 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 4, 2022) .....4

*In re Planned Parenthood Fed'n of Am., Inc.*,  
52 F.4th 625 (5th Cir. 2022) .....3, 5

*In re Toyota Motor Corp.*,  
747 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....3

*VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.*,  
2019 WL 8013949 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 7, 2019).....4

*VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.*,  
2020 WL 8254867 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 31, 2020) .....4

**Rules and Statutes**

Rule 30(b)(6).....4

Rule 45 .....4

Advanced Silicon Technologies LLC’s (“AST”) Opposition to NXP USA, Inc.’s (“NXP”) Motion to Transfer Venue (Dkt. 46) unduly emphasizes third parties and foreign NXP employees with tenuous connections to the accused products while downplaying (or ignoring) substantial Austin connections—including witnesses, documents, and localized interest. AST does not dispute the absence of witnesses and evidence in the Waco Division. Instead, AST highlights two irrelevant issues: (1) *foreign* suppliers for technologies in the accused products, and (2) Texas Instruments’ (“TI”) Dallas headquarters (as TI employed non-Texas-based prior art authors). Neither factors into the transfer inquiry. By focusing on third parties (outside the Waco Division), AST ignores relevant Austin-based NXP personnel in finance, marketing, project management, and engineering. And, while AST correctly identifies TI prior art, AST does not—and cannot—contend the prior art authors are located in Dallas. *See* Exs. 17-21 (none in Texas).

AST’s Opposition does not address NXP’s authority from this Court transferring cases,<sup>1</sup> but instead relies upon unsupported assertions and outdated law. AST contends without support that “NXP must show a particularly acute burden of proceeding here or advantage to [] Austin” to satisfy the clearly more convenient transfer burden (Dkt. 51, “Opp.” at 1), but NXP’s burden is between “clear and convincing” and “mere preponderance,” and NXP “need not show an individual factor *clearly* favors transfer” (*AlmondNet, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 6:21-CV-00891-ADA, 2022 WL 17574082, at \*2 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 28, 2022)). NXP’s Motion should be granted.

#### **I. NXP’S AUSTIN WITNESSES STRONGLY FAVOR TRANSFER**

The majority of NXP’s potential witnesses are in Austin, and NXP has no facilities or

---

<sup>1</sup> Mot. at 4 (citing *Freshub, Inc. v. Amazon.com Inc.*, 6:19-cv-388-ADA, Dkt. 29 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 2019); *DataScape, Ltd. v. Dell Techs., Inc.*, 2019 WL 4254069 (W.D. Tex. June 7, 2019)), 6 (*Hammond Dev. Int’l, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 2020 WL 6136783 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2020); *Identity Security LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, 6:21-cv-00460-ADA, Dkt. 59 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2022); *Neo Wireless, LLC v. Dell Techs. Inc.*, 6:21-cv-00024-ADA, Dkt. 60 at 4–5 (W.D. Tex. Jan. 20, 2022)).

presence in the Waco Division. Mot. at 1-2. NXP employees Percy Gilbert (Product Development) (Ex. 23 at 67:13, 70:8-22; Ex. 22 at 2), Jeff Kudrick (Software R&D Lead) (Dkt. 46-1 (“Wagner Decl.”) at ¶ 5; Ex. 23 at 100:1 – 101:10; Ex. 22 at 4), Amanda McGregor (Marketing Lead) (Wagner Decl. at ¶ 6), Gowri Chindalore (Strategy) (Wagner Decl. at ¶ 6; Ex. 23 at 67:12, 70:1-7; Ex. 22 at 6), Ray Henling (Finance Controller) (Wagner Decl. at ¶ 6; Ex. 23 at 67:18-21; Ex. 22 at 2 ) are based in Austin, have relevant information, and are likely to testify in this case. AST incorrectly “relies on outdated law to argue that party witnesses should be given little weight.” Opp. at 11-12; *Corrino Holdings LLC v. Expedia, Inc.*, 6:20-CV-309-ADA, 2022 WL 1094621, at \*4 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 12, 2022). AST also incorrectly suggests that NXP’s witnesses would not face inconvenience because they reside within about 100 miles of the Waco courthouse. Opp. at 11-12; *see Freshub*, No. 6:19-cv-388-ADA, Dkt. 29 at 2 (“With respect to the issue of the geographic distance between Waco and Austin being less than 100 miles, . . . even 80 or 90 miles is inconvenient.”). And, AST’s offer to reimburse witness travel expense and lodging falls short, ignoring “[t]he most important factor in the transfer analysis is the convenience of the witnesses” (*In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2009)), and the Federal Circuit has emphasized the inconvenience of “be[ing] away from their homes and work for an extended period of time” (*In re Google LLC*, 2021 WL 4427899, at \*4 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 27, 2021)).

To the extent it substantively addresses NXP’s Austin based witnesses, AST’s Opposition downplays the presence of these NXP witnesses because they allegedly were not involved in the “development of GPU or VPU drivers and codecs.” Opp. at 5. But AST cannot convincingly argue that only foreign-based witnesses with knowledge of GPU or VPU drivers and codecs would be trial witnesses. *See generally Datascope, Ltd. v. Dell Techs., Inc.*, 6:19-CV-00129-ADA, 2019 WL 4254069, at \*2 (W.D. Tex. June 7, 2019) (finding this factor supported transfer to Austin

# 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.