

Miscellaneous Docket No. 23-120

---

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. 6:22-cv-00149-ADA, Hon. Alan D Albright

---

**APPLE INC.'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR A STAY  
OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
PENDING RESOLUTION OF APPLE'S MANDAMUS  
PETITION**

---

Brian Rosenthal  
Katherine Q. Dominguez  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166

Neema Jalali  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000  
San Francisco, CA 94105

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

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

*Counsel for Petitioner*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
LIST OF EXHIBITS .....	v
RULE 27(A)(2) STATEMENT .....	vi
INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	6
Apple moves to transfer this case to the Austin Division of the Western District of Texas, leading to venue discovery .....	6
Apple seeks to postpone the Markman hearing until the district court resolves transfer .....	7
The district court denies Apple's motion to stay .....	9
LEGAL STANDARD .....	11
ARGUMENT .....	11
I. Apple's Petition Makes A Compelling Case For Mandamus .....	12
II. Absent A Stay, Apple Would Be Irreparably Harmed By Participating In Substantive Proceedings In The Waco Division .....	16
III. A Brief Stay Would Not Harm SpaceTime .....	18
IV. The Public Interest Favors A Stay .....	19
CONCLUSION .....	20
CERTIFICATE OF INTEREST	
EXHIBITS	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Am. Dredging Co. v. Miller</i> , 510 U.S. 443 (1994).....	19
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , 52 F.4th 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2022).....	3, 4, 13
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....	3, 13, 14
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2022-163, 2022 WL 16754376 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 8, 2022) .....	4, 13
<i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2022-164, 2022 WL 16754153 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 8, 2022) .....	4, 13
<i>Ex parte Collett</i> , 337 U.S. 55 (1949).....	14
<i>Cont'l Grain Co. v. The Barge FBL-585</i> , 364 U.S. 19 (1960).....	13
<i>E-Watch, Inc. v. Lorex Can., Inc.</i> , No. H-12-3314, 2013 WL 5425298 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2013) .....	18
<i>In re EMC Corp.</i> , 501 F. App'x 973 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	13
<i>In re Google Inc.</i> , No. 2015-138, 2015 WL 5294800 (Fed. Cir. July 16, 2015).....	4, 13, 16, 17
<i>Hilton v. Braunskill</i> , 481 U.S. 770 (1987).....	11, 16, 18
<i>In re Horseshoe Ent.</i> , 337 F.3d 429 (5th Cir. 2003).....	13, 16

<i>In re Lloyd's Register N. Am., Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 283 (5th Cir. 2015).....	17
<i>In re Nintendo Co.</i> , 544 F. App'x 934 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....	13
<i>Nken v. Holder</i> , 556 U.S. 418 (2009).....	11, 16, 18, 19
<i>In re Radmax, Ltd.</i> , 720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013).....	2, 3, 15
<i>In re SK hynix Inc.</i> , 835 F. App'x 600 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	3, 4, 13, 17, 18
<i>Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc.</i> , 897 F.2d 511 (Fed. Cir. 1990) .....	11, 12
<i>In re TracFone Wireless, Inc.</i> , 848 F. App'x 899 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	3, 4, 13, 16, 17, 18
<i>In re True Chem. Sols., LLC</i> , 841 F. App'x 240 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....	15
<i>VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.</i> , 759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014) .....	19
<i>In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.</i> , 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008).....	17
<i>Weingarten Realty Inv'rs v. Miller</i> , 661 F.3d 904 (5th Cir. 2011).....	19
<b>Statutes</b>	
28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).....	2, 13, 14, 15
Act of June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 937 .....	14
<b>Rules and Regulations</b>	
Fed. Cir. R. 8(c).....	2

Fed. R. App. P. 8(a)(2)(A)(ii).....	2
-------------------------------------	---

## **Other Authorities**

14D Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Edward H. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure § 3809 (3d ed. 2007) .....	15
Motion to Dismiss, <i>In re Apple Inc.</i> , No. 2023-100, Dkt. 11 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 9, 2022).....	1

# 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.