

Misc. No. 2020-135

United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit

IN RE APPLE, INC.

On Petition for a Writ of Mandamus from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas, Case No. 6:19-CV-00532-ADA,
Judge Alan Albright

**UNILOC 2017 LLC NON-CONFIDENTIAL RESPONSE TO
APPLE INC.'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

WILLIAM E. DAVIS, III
DAVIS FIRM PC
213 N. Fredonia Street
Suite 230
Longview, Texas 75601
(903) 230-9090
bdavis@bdavisfirm.com
Counsel for Plaintiff-Respondent

CHRISTIAN JOHN HURT
DAVIS FIRM PC
213 N. Fredonia Street
Suite 230
Longview, Texas 75601
(903) 230-9090
churt@bdavisfirm.com
Counsel for Plaintiff-Respondent

JULY 1, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST

Counsel for Plaintiff-Respondent, Christian Hurt, certifies the following:

1. The full name of every party or amicus represented by me is:

Uniloc 2017, LLC

2. The name of the real party in interest (if the party named in the caption is not the real party in interest) represented by me is:

None.

3. All parent corporations and any publicly held companies that own 10 percent or more of the stock of the party or amicus curiae represented by me are:

CF Uniloc Holdings, LLC

4. The names of all law firms and 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 are:

William Ellsworth Davis, III, Christian J. Hurt, Debra Coleman, Edward K. Chin, and Ty Wilson, Davis Firm, P.C.;

5. The title and number of any case known to counsel to be pending in this or any other court 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):

No other appeal from these proceedings was previously before this Court or any other appellate court. There is no case pending in this Court or any other court that will directly affect or be directly affected by the Court's decision here.

DATED: July 1, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Christian John Hurt
Christian John Hurt
Counsel for Plaintiff-Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... iii

INTRODUCTION..... 1

STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT 2

STATEMENT OF ISSUE 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 3

 I. The '088 Patent..... 3

 II. The District Court Litigation 3

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION 6

 I. The Standard for Mandamus is Exacting—Requiring a Clear Abuse
 of Discretion That Produced a Patently Erroneous Result..... 6

 II. It is Proper for Apple to Face This Suit in the WDTX—Where
 Apple is Poised to Be the Largest Private Employer in the
 District..... 6

 III. The District Court Did Not Clearly Abuse Its Discretion When It
 Found that Apple Failed to Meet its Heightened Transfer Burden..... 10

 A. The Decisions of Other Courts to Transfer Other Uniloc Cases Was
 Not Binding, as Apple Admitted Below..... 11

 B. Apple Does Not Show Error in the District Court’s Findings on the
 Private-Interest Factors 13

 1. The Court Reasonably Found That the Convenience of Willing
 Witnesses Factor Was Neutral..... 13

 2. The Court Did Not Hold That Uniloc’s Choice of Forum Was a
 Distinct Factor 20

3. The Court Reasonably Found That the Compulsory Process Factor Was Neutral.....	20
4. The Court Reasonably Found That the Location of Sources of Proof Only Slightly Weighed in Favor of Transfer.....	22
5. The Court Reasonably Found That Judicial Economy Weighed Heavily Against Transfer.....	25
C. Apple Does Not Show Error in the District Court’s Analysis of the Public-Interest Factors	28
1. The Court Reasonably Concluded That the Local Interest Factor Was Neutral	28
2. The Court Reasonably Found That the Time to Trial Factor Weighed Against Transfer.....	30
D. The District Court Was Well Within Its Discretion to Deny Apple’s Motion in View of These Factual Findings	32
CONCLUSION	33

CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL OMITTED

The redacted material on pages 19 and 22 of this Response includes confidential information subject to the Protective Order entered by the district court on June 5, 2020.

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.