

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND DIVISION**

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NVIDIA CORPORATION, VELOCITY
MICRO, INC. D/B/A VELOCITY MICRO,
AND VELOCITY HOLDINGS, LLC

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:14-cv-00757-REP

**SAMSUNG'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
TRANSFER, SEVER, AND STAY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	5
A. The Litigation Backstory	5
B. The Parties: Samsung, NVIDIA, and Velocity.....	6
C. The Causes of Action: Patent Infringement and False Advertising.....	8
III. ARGUMENT.....	9
A. Claims Against Velocity Should Not be Severed or Stayed.....	9
1. <i>Claims Against Velocity are Not Peripheral, and All Claims Should be Tried Together</i>	9
2. <i>Adjudication of Claims Against NVIDIA Will Not Resolve the Claims Against Velocity</i>	11
3. <i>Transfer is Not Warranted Under § 1404(a)</i>	12
B. The Jurisdictional and Convenience Factors in § 1404(a) Weigh in Favor of Retaining Venue	13
1. <i>Jurisdiction is Proper in EDVA, Not in NDCA</i>	13
2. <i>Convenience Factors Weigh in Favor of Retaining Venue in This District</i>	15
a. Samsung’s Choice of Forum is Entitled to Substantial Weight.....	15
b. Convenience of the Parties and Witnesses Counsels Against Transfer.....	19
c. The Interests of Justice Weigh in Favor of Resolving This Matter in Virginia	22
IV. CONCLUSION.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Acterna, L.L.C. v. Adtech, Inc.</i> , 129 F. Supp. 2d 936 (E.D. Va. 2001)	17
<i>Am. Commercial Lines, LLC v. Ne. Mar. Inst., Inc.</i> , 588 F. Supp. 2d 935 (S.D. In. 2008)	23
<i>Amini Innovation Corp. v. JS Imports, Inc.</i> , 497 F. Supp. 2d 1093 (C.D. Cal. 2007)	15
<i>Arnold v. E. Air Lines, Inc.</i> , 681 F.2d 186 (4th Cir. 1982) <i>on reh'g</i> , 712 F.2d 899 (4th Cir. 1983).....	13, 25
<i>Bluestone Innovations, LLC v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i> , 940 F. Supp. 2d 310 (E.D. Va. 2013)	24
<i>Brown Mfg. Corp. v. Alpha Lawn & Garden Equip., Inc.</i> , 219 F. Supp. 2d 705 (E.D. Va. 2002)	10
<i>Byerson v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC</i> , 467 F. Supp. 2d 627 (E.D. Va. 2006)	19
<i>Cognitronics Imaging Sys., Inc. v. Recognition Research Inc.</i> , 83 F. Supp. 2d 689 (E.D. Va. 2000)	23
<i>CollegeSource, Inc. v. AcademyOne, Inc.</i> , 653 F.3d 1066 (9th Cir. 2011)	14
<i>Collins v. Straight, Inc.</i> , 748 F.2d 916 (4th Cir. 1984)	4, 13, 15
<i>Corry v. CFM Majestic Inc.</i> , 16 F. Supp. 2d 660 (E.D. Va. 1998)	9, 10
<i>DietGoal Innovations LLC v. Wegmans Food Markets, Inc.</i> , No. 2:13CV154, 2014 WL 2561222 (E.D. Va. June 6, 2014).....	13, 25
<i>E. Scientific Mktg., Inc. v. Tekna-Seal, Inc.</i> , 696 F. Supp. 173 (E.D. Va. 1988)	16
<i>Focht v. Sol Melia S.A.</i> , No. C-10-0906 EMC, 2012 WL 162564 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2012)	14
<i>Fujitsu Media Devices Ltd. v. Samsung Electro-Mechanics Co.</i> , No. 3:01-cv-00782-REP	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Gebr. Brasseler GmbH & Co. KG v. Abrasive Tech., Inc.</i> , No. 1:08CV1246GBL/TCB, 2009 WL 874513 (E.D. Va. Mar. 27, 2009)	17
<i>Gemalto S.A. v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 6:10CV561 LED-JDL, 2011 WL 5838212 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 18, 2011).....	18
<i>GTE Wireless, Inc. v. Qualcomm, Inc.</i> , 71 F. Supp. 2d 517 (E.D. Va. 1999)	17
<i>Heinz Kettler GMBH & Co. v. Indian Indus., Inc.</i> , 575 F. Supp. 2d 728 (E.D. Va. 2008)	9
<i>Heinz Kettler GMBH & Co. v. Razor USA, LLC</i> , 750 F. Supp. 2d 660 (E.D. Va. 2010)	13, 15, 24, 26
<i>Hitachi, Ltd. v. Samsung Display Devices Co.</i> , No. 1:97-cv-01988-REP	18
<i>Hoffman v. Blaski</i> , 363 U.S. 335 (1960).....	13
<i>Hunter Eng'g Co. v. ACCU Indus., Inc.</i> , 245 F. Supp. 2d 761 (E.D. Va. 2002)	16
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	19
<i>Jaffé v. LSI Corp.</i> , 874 F. Supp. 2d 499 (E.D. Va. 2012)	13
<i>James v. Experian Info. Solutions, Inc.</i> , No. 3:12-CV-902, 2014 WL 29041 (E.D. Va. Jan. 2, 2014)	20
<i>Koh v. MicroTek Int'l, Inc.</i> , 250 F. Supp. 2d 627 (E.D. Va. 2003)	9, 22
<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936).....	9
<i>LG Electronics Inc. v. Advanced Creative Computer Corp.</i> , 131 F. Supp. 2d 804 (E.D. Va. 2001)	10, 13
<i>Lugus IP v. Volvo Car Corp.</i> , No. 3:11-cv-811-HEH, 2012 WL 1715983 (E.D. Va. May 15, 2012)	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Lycos, Inc. v. TiVo, Inc.</i> , 499 F. Supp. 2d 685 (E.D. Va. 2007)	17
<i>Macronix Int'l Co. v. Spansion Inc.</i> , No. 3:13CV679, 2014 WL 934521 (E.D. Va. Mar. 10, 2014)	16, 22
<i>Mavrix Photo, Inc. v. Brand Techs., Inc.</i> , 647 F.3d 1218 (9th Cir. 2011)	14
<i>Mullins v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC</i> , No. CIV.A. 3:05CV888, 2006 WL 1214024 (E.D. Va. Apr. 28, 2006)	16, 22, 25
<i>Natural Wellness Centers of Am., Inc. v. Golden Health Products, Inc.</i> , No. C 12-05586 CW, 2013 WL 245594 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 22, 2013).....	14
<i>NVIDIA Corp. v. Samsung Electronics, Inc.</i> , No. 1:14-cv-01127-LPS (D. Del. 2014).....	5
<i>Plymouth Tube Co. v. O'Donnell</i> , No. 95-CV277, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8912 (N.D. Ill. Jun. 27, 1995)	23
<i>Quinton Instrument Co. v. Datascope Corp.</i> , No. 3:96-cv-160, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22740 (E.D. Va. June 3, 1996).....	16, 25
<i>Rockstar Consortium US LP v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-00894-JRG, 2014 WL 2965880 (E.D. Tex. July 1, 2014).....	18
<i>Samsung Am., v. Vine Enters.</i> , No. 1:99-cv-01151-CMH.....	18
<i>Samsung Electronics Co. v. Rambus, Inc.</i> , 386 F. Supp. 2d 708 (E.D. Va. 2005)	passim
<i>Samsung Electronics v. Ricoh Corp.</i> , No. 1:94-cv-01267	18
<i>Semiconductor Energy Lab Co. v. Samsung Electronics Co.</i> , No. 1:00-cv-01525-TSE.....	18
<i>Shared Memory Graphics LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 5:09CV5128 BSM, 2010 WL 5151612 (W.D. Ark. May 27, 2010)	18
<i>Taltwell, LLC v. Zonet USA Corp.</i> , No. CIV.A. 3:07CV543, 2007 WL 4562874 (E.D. Va. Dec. 20, 2007).....	22

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.