

Miscellaneous Docket No. 21-187

---

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. 6:21-cv-00926-ADA, Hon. Alan D Albright

---

**APPLE INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

---

Sean C. Cunningham  
Erin Gibson  
DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
401 B Street, Suite 1700  
San Diego, CA 92101

John M. Guaragna  
DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
303 Colorado Street, Suite 3000  
Austin, TX 78701

Mark D. Fowler  
DLA PIPER LLP (US)  
2000 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

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

Edmund R. Hirschfeld  
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*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
I.    The District Court’s Order Directly Violates This Court’s <i>Intel I</i> Ruling And Is A Clear Abuse Of Discretion.....	4
II.   Even If The District Court Had Properly Applied § 1404(a), Its Decision Would Be A Clear Abuse Of Discretion.....	8
A.   The district court’s original grounds for transfer still favor Austin over Waco.....	9
B.   Additional factors do not alter the § 1404(a) analysis.....	15
CONCLUSION.....	20
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Adobe</i> , 823 F. App'x 929 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	16
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	16
<i>Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct.</i> , 542 U.S. 367 (2004).....	3
<i>In re Cragar Indus., Inc.</i> , 706 F.2d 503 (5th Cir. 1983).....	7, 8, 10
<i>In re Hulu, LLC</i> , --- F. App'x ---, 2021 WL 3278194 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 2, 2021) .....	13
<i>In re Intel Corp.</i> , 841 F. App'x 192 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	1, 4, 5, 6, 7
<i>In re Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , --- F.4th ---, 2021 WL 4343309 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 24, 2021) .....	10, 13, 15
<i>In re Radmax, Ltd.</i> , 720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013).....	14
<i>In re Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2 F.4th 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	10, 15, 16
<i>In re True Chem. Sols., LLC</i> , 841 F. App'x 240 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	17
<i>VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.</i> , No. 1:19-cv-00977-ADA, 2020 WL 6828034 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 20, 2020).....	6, 7

*VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.*,  
No. 1:19-cv-00977-ADA, 2020 WL 8254867 (W.D. Tex.  
Dec. 31, 2020) ..... 15

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) ..... 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 77 ..... 6

## INTRODUCTION

Apple’s petition presented a straightforward case for mandamus: The district court here, having previously concluded under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) that the “convenience of parties and witnesses” and the “interest of justice” warranted transfer of venue to the Austin Division of the Western District of Texas, re-transferred the case to the Waco Division shortly before trial was set to commence. It did so without citing any authority, without analyzing the § 1404(a) factors, and without identifying any change that had undermined the original rationale for transfer from Waco to Austin. In short, the district court failed to do exactly what this Court held is required when it issued a writ of mandamus to the same district court in highly similar circumstances last year. *See In re Intel Corp.*, 841 F. App’x 192 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (“*Intel I*”).

The district court instead relied exclusively on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and the fact that this case, like every other civil case pending in Austin, might not be able to go to trial on its scheduled date due to the restrictions on courthouse access that the Austin Division has put in place to deal with the ongoing public health crisis

# 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.