

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

In re: APPLE INC.,
Petitioner

2020-127

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas in No. 1:20-cv-00351-ADA, Judge Alan D. Albright.

ON PETITION

Before O'MALLEY, WALLACH, and STOLL, *Circuit Judges*.
STOLL, *Circuit Judge*.

O R D E R

Apple Inc. petitions for a writ of mandamus directing the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas to direct transfer of this action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. STC.UNM opposes the petition. Apple replies. For the following reasons, we deny Apple's petition.

BACKGROUND

This petition arises out of a complaint filed by STC.UNM in the Waco Division of the Western District of

Texas, alleging that STC.UNM's asserted patents are infringed by various Apple products supporting the IEEE 802.11ac wireless networking standard. According to STC.UNM, the asserted patents "read on" that wireless network standard and the accused devices infringe by being compliant with the standard. Resp. at 4. Apple indicates that its accused products support the wireless standard via semiconductor chips developed by Broadcom Inc., a company with offices in San Jose, Irvine, and San Diego, California, as well as in the Western District in Austin, Texas.

The district court granted Apple's motion to transfer this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) in part, holding that Apple had demonstrated trial in the Austin Division of the Western District of Texas was clearly more convenient than the Waco Division, but that Apple had not clearly established that the Northern District of California was more suitable for trial than Austin, Texas. In doing so, the district court relied on *Weatherford Tech. Holdings, LLC v. Tesco Corp.*, No. 2:17-CV-00456-JRG, 2018 WL 4620636 (E.D. Tex. May 22, 2018) for the proposition that a court must draw all reasonable inferences and resolve all factual conflicts in favor of the non-moving party when assessing a § 1404(a) transfer for convenience.

The district court acknowledged that the Northern District of California would be more convenient for the Apple employees and Broadcom employees who were specifically identified in the declarations in support of Apple's motion and that it would be easier to access or transfer any documentary sources from Apple or Broadcom that were located in the Northern District of California or other parts of California. However, the district court found that the presence of the Wi-Fi Alliance in the Western District of Texas mitigated against weighing the pertinent convenience factors strongly in favor of transfer, because it was "possible—if not likely—that STC.UNM could require the Wi-Fi Alliance as a significant source of proof." A. 7. The district

IN RE: APPLE INC.

3

court also weighed against transfer a pending suit in the same district in which STC.UNM asserted the same claims of the same patents against another defendant, determining that there was a shorter time to trial in the Western District of Texas on the current schedule for this case as compared to the median time to trial in the Northern District of California.

The district court also found that the local interest factor did not weigh in favor of Northern California. The district court explained that, like the Northern District of California, the Western District of Texas had a significant interest because Apple was likely “one of the largest employers in each District.” A. 14. Despite Apple’s assertions that only its employees in Northern California had relevant and material information, the district court noted that Apple had issued a job posting for engineers with knowledge of the 802.11ac standard for its Austin campus, which the court found showed that “business Apple conducts within this District will be affected” by the case. *Id.* The court added that one of the accused products is made in Austin, Texas, “giving those involved with its manufacture a localized interest in determinations made regarding the infringement—or lack thereof—found in this case.” A. 15.

The court, moreover, concluded that the localized interests of third parties weighed in favor of Western Texas. The court noted that the Wi-Fi Alliance, an organization that promotes, certifies, and ensures uniform adoption of Wi-Fi standards, including the 802.11ac standard, was located in Austin, Texas and had “a heavy localized interest in this case because infringement based on compliance with the 802.11ac standard would affect the Wi-Fi [A]lliance[']s promotions and certifications” and hinder its “goal of spreading use and adoption of the standard.” *Id.* The court added that Broadcom also had a significant presence in Austin. The court acknowledged that Broadcom was headquartered in the Northern District of California.

However, it found that it was “more reasonable to assume that the chips [that were at issue in this case] were designed in the Central or Southern Districts of California.” *Id.*

DISCUSSION

Apple now seeks for this court to issue a writ of mandamus to compel transfer to the Northern District of California. Such a request requires a showing of a clear abuse of discretion that produced a patently erroneous result. *In re TS Tech USA Corp.*, 551 F.3d 1315, 1318–19 (Fed. Cir. 2008); *see also Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Dist. of Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 381 (2004) (requiring that a petitioner seeking mandamus establish that the right to relief is “clear and indisputable” (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)). We issue such relief sparingly and only in “extraordinary” circumstances. *Cheney*, 542 U.S. at 380 (quoting *Ex parte Fahey*, 332 U.S. 258, 259–260 (1947)) (internal quotation marks omitted). Apple has not met that demanding standard here.

Apple does not dispute that the district court considered all the relevant transfer factors. Nor can Apple now take back its previous assertion to the district court that the Austin Division is “clearly more convenient” than the Waco Division. A. 121. Instead, Apple primarily complains that in not transferring to the Northern District of California, the district court erred in assessing and weighing the relevant transfer factors. But the district court’s grant of the alternative relief that Apple requested counsels against the extraordinary remedy of mandamus. Given that Apple received a transfer to its second-most convenient venue, it is difficult to accept Apple’s assertion that the result here is patently erroneous.

We do question the propriety of the district court’s reliance on *Weatherford* to hold that a court must draw all reasonable inferences and resolve all factual conflicts in favor of the non-moving party when assessing a § 1404(a)

IN RE: APPLE INC.

5

transfer for convenience. We are not convinced that this standard, which sounds like summary judgment, should apply to a transfer motion. The plaintiff's choice of forum is already protected by the elevated "clearly more convenient" standard that the movant must meet. Nonetheless, whatever may be said about the validity of drawing inferences and resolving factual disputes in favor of the non-moving party in the context of a transfer motion, we cannot say that Apple's right to relief here is indisputably clear.

Apple has not clearly and indisputably established the right to transfer to Northern California based on the convenience of witnesses. We agree with Apple that "[t]he convenience of the witnesses is probably the single most important factor in transfer analysis." *In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). We also share Apple's concern with the district court's reliance on *ADS Security* for the discordant proposition that the convenience of party witnesses is given "little weight." A. 10 (citing *ADS Sec. L.P. v. Advanced Detection Sec. Servs., Inc.*, No. A-09-CA-773-LY, 2010 WL 1170976, at *4 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 23, 2010)); *see also, e.g., Genentech*, 566 F.3d at 1343–45 (considering convenience of party and non-party witnesses alike). Nevertheless, Apple's right to relief is not clear and indisputable here. The district court held that, as a whole, the convenience of party and non-party witnesses weighed in favor of transfer. In support of its holding, the district court determined that the convenience of the identified non-party witnesses was neutral overall. Thus, it is not as if the district court applied *ADS Security* to tip the scales in favor of non-party witnesses while giving party witnesses little weight. Instead, the convenience of the party witnesses was the determinative consideration here—and indeed, determinative in Apple's favor.

Nor has Apple clearly and indisputably established the right to transfer to Northern California based on countervailing convenience or localized interest considerations.

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.