

Miscellaneous Docket No. ____

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

IN RE APPLE INC.,

Petitioner.

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the
United States District Court for the
Western District of Texas
No. 6:19-cv-00532-ADA, Hon. Alan D Albright

**APPLE INC.'S PETITION FOR
WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

John M. Guaragna
DLA PIPER
401 Congress Avenue
Suite 2500
Austin, TX 78701

Melanie L. Bostwick
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP
1152 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 339-8400

Abigail Colella
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP
51 West 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019

Melanie R. Hallums
ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP
2121 Main Street
Wheeling, WV 26003

Counsel for Petitioner

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

In re Apple Inc. _____ v. _____

Case No. _____

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for the:

(petitioner) (appellant) (respondent) (appellee) (amicus) (name of party)

Apple Inc.

certifies the following (use "None" if applicable; use extra sheets if necessary):

| 1. Full Name of Party Represented by me | 2. Name of Real Party in interest (Please only include any real party in interest NOT identified in Question 3) represented by me is: | 3. Parent corporations and publicly held companies that own 10% or more of stock in the party |
|---|---|---|
| Apple Inc. | Apple Inc. | None |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

4. The names of all law firms and the partners or associates that appeared for the party or amicus now represented by me in the trial court or agency or are expected to appear in this court (**and who have not or will not enter an appearance in this case**) are:

DLA Piper LLP: Brian K. Erickson, Christine K. Corbett, Erik R. Fuehrer, Larissa Bifano, Mark D. Fowler, Michael Van Handel, Summer Torrez

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP: Jeffrey T. Quilici

FORM 9. Certificate of Interest

Form 9
Rev. 10/17

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court or agency that will directly affect or be directly affected by this court's decision in the pending appeal. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 47.4(a)(5) and 47.5(b). (The parties should attach continuation pages as necessary).

None

6/15/2020

Date

/s/ Melanie L. Bostwick

Signature of counsel

Melanie L. Bostwick

Printed name of counsel

Please Note: All questions must be answered

cc: _____

Reset Fields

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST | i |
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | v |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| RELIEF SOUGHT | 3 |
| ISSUE PRESENTED | 3 |
| FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY | 3 |
| In 2017 and 2018, Texas Courts Transfer Twenty-One Uniloc Cases Against Apple to the Northern District of California..... | 3 |
| After Voluntarily Dismissing the Previous Version of This Suit to Avoid Transfer, Uniloc Refiles in the Waco Division of the Western District of Texas..... | 5 |
| Apple Seeks Transfer to the Northern District of California..... | 6 |
| The District Court Denies Apple’s Transfer Motion..... | 9 |
| REASONS FOR ISSUING THE WRIT | 10 |
| I. Mandamus Is Warranted Because Transfer Under § 1404(a) Has Become Effectively Unavailable In The Waco Division Of The Western District Of Texas, Allowing Unabashed Forum- And Judge-Shopping..... | 12 |
| II. Any Analysis Of The § 1404(a) Factors That Leads To A Denial Of Transfer Would Be Patently Erroneous..... | 17 |
| A. The private-interest factors all favor transfer..... | 18 |
| 1. All likely trial witnesses are in California and none are in Texas..... | 18 |
| 2. Plaintiff’s choice of forum is not a distinct factor..... | 25 |
| 3. Compulsory process for critical witnesses is available only in California..... | 26 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 4. | All relevant sources of proof are in or around the Northern District of California..... | 29 |
| 5. | Judicial economy strongly favors transfer. | 32 |
| B. | The public-interest factors clearly favor transfer. | 34 |
| 1. | The interest of the district where the accused technology was designed and developed is self-evidently stronger than that of a district with no tie to this case. | 34 |
| 2. | The district court’s speculation about its untested trial plan cannot outweigh the factors heavily favoring transfer..... | 37 |
| | CONCLUSION | 40 |
| | CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | |
| | CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE | |

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.