

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

CREDO SEMICONDUCTOR INC. and CREDO  
TECHNOLOGY GROUP LTD.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VOLEX PLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:25-cv-00298-JRG



**DEFENDANT VOLEX PLC'S MOTION TO TRANSFER  
VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. RELEVANT FACTS ..... 1

    A. Plaintiffs and the Patents-in-Suit Are Closely Tied to California, and Lack a Material Nexus with Texas ..... 1

    B. Defendant Volex plc Lacks Any Material Nexus with Texas ..... 3

    C. The Relevant Third-Party Supplier, [REDACTED] Lacks Any Material Nexus with Texas ..... 5

III. ARGUMENT ..... 6

    A. Credo Could Have Sued Volex in the Northern District of California ..... 7

    B. The Private Interest Factors Clearly Favor Transfer ..... 8

        1. More Sources of Proof Are Available in the Northern District of California than in this District ..... 9

        2. Witnesses Are Available Through Compulsory Process in the Northern District of California, But Not in This District ..... 10

        3. It Would Be Far More Convenient For Witnesses if this Action Were Transferred to the Northern District of California ..... 11

        4. Transfer Would Not Cause Any Practical Problems for the Northern District of California or this Court ..... 12

    C. The Public Interest Factors Either Favor Transfer, or Do Not Weigh Against Transfer ..... 13

        1. This District Is as Congested as the Northern District of California ..... 13

        2. This District Does Not Have a Local Interest in Resolving this Case ..... 14

        3. This District and Northern District of California Are Equally Capable of Assessing the Applicable Law ..... 15

        4. There Will Be No Conflict of Patent Law as Applied Between this District and the Northern District of California ..... 15

IV. CONCLUSION ..... 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Aguilar-Ayala v. Ruiz</i> , 973 F.2d 411 (5th Cir. 1992) .....	10
<i>Allstate Ins. Co. v. Toshner</i> , 2024 WL 4783844 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 28, 2024).....	8
<i>Balthaser Online, Inc. v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.</i> , 2011 WL 1526964 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2011).....	10
<i>Camatic Proprietary Ltd. v. Irwin Seating Co.</i> , 2017 WL 2362029 (N.D. Tex. May 31, 2017) .....	10, 15
<i>Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Infinera Corp.</i> , 2021 WL 518478 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 10, 2021).....	7
<i>Duckworth v. Tractor Supply Co.</i> , 2022 WL 2070610 (E.D. Tex. June 8, 2022).....	10
<i>Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert</i> , 330 U.S. 501 (1947).....	8, 13
<i>Hammond Dev. Int’l, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 6136783 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2020).....	11
<i>Internet Mach. LLC v. Alienware Corp.</i> , 2011 WL 2292961 (E.D. Tex. June 7, 2011).....	10
<i>In re Acer Am. Corp.</i> , 626 F.3d 1252 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	14
<i>In re Apple, Inc.</i> , 979 F.3d 1332 (Fed. Cir. 2020).....	9, 14
<i>In re Genentech, Inc.</i> , 566 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	13
<i>In re Google, LLC</i> , 2021 WL 4427899 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 27, 2021) .....	11
<i>In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> , 587 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	14

*In re Juniper Networks, Inc.*,  
 14 F.4th 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2021) ..... 11

*In re Pandora Media, LLC*,  
 2021 WL 4772805 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 13, 2021)..... 12

*In re Radmax, Ltd.*,  
 720 F.3d 285 (5th Cir. 2013) ..... 9

*In re Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.*,  
 2 F.4th 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2021) .....9, 14

*In re TracFone Wireless, Inc.*,  
 852 F. App’x 537 (Fed. Cir. 2021) ..... 12

*In re TOA Techs., Inc.*,  
 543 F. App’x 1006 (Fed. Cir. 2013) .....9, 15

*In re Volkswagen AG*,  
 371 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2004) .....*passim*

*In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*,  
 545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) .....*passim*

*JetBlue Airways Corp. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*,  
 960 F. Supp. 2d 383 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) .....10

*Optimum Power Solutions LLC v. Apple Inc.*,  
 794 F. Supp. 2d 696 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 22, 2011).....8, 12

*Orbital Australia Pty Ltd. v. Daimler AG*,  
 2015 WL 4042178 (E.D. Va. July 1, 2015)..... 7

*Peteet v. Dow Chem. Co.*,  
 868 F.2d 1428 (5th Cir. 1989) ..... 6

*Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*,  
 454 U.S. 235 (1981)..... 8

*Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Blackboard Inc.*,  
 2020 WL 4578702 (W.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) ..... 10

*Voxpath RS, LLC v. LG Elecs. U.S.A., Inc.*,  
 2012 WL 194370 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2012)..... 12

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3)..... 7, 8

28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) .....*passim*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

None of the parties in this case has any material connection with this District. To be clear, Defendant Volex plc (“Volex” or “Defendant”) never made or sold the allegedly infringing products in Texas (let alone in this District), Plaintiffs Credo Semiconductor Inc. and Credo Technology Group Ltd. (collectively, “Credo” or “Plaintiffs”) have little to no connection with Texas (let alone this District), and Volex maintains no operations or contacts with Texas (let alone this District). Instead, all the parties have (either directly or through a subsidiary) significant connections with California, in particular the Northern District of California. Additionally, highly relevant third parties, including the supplier of a key component of the allegedly infringing products, as well as the vast majority of the inventors listed on the patents-in-suit, are also based within the Northern District of California. Accordingly, Volex respectfully moves, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), to transfer this action to the Northern District of California, which, when compared to this District, has far greater ease of access to sources of proof, has compulsory process available for significantly more key non-party witnesses, is far more convenient for both party and non-party witnesses, and has by far the most local interest in this action.

## **II. RELEVANT FACTS**

### **A. Plaintiffs and the Patents-in-Suit Are Closely Tied to California, and Lack a Material Nexus with Texas**

Plaintiffs allege that Volex infringes U.S. Patent Nos. 10,877,233; 11,012,252; and 11,032,111 (collectively, the “patents-in-suit”), which allegedly are related to active electrical cables, “by making, using, offering for sale or selling within the United States, or importing into the United States” certain accused products. Dkt. 9 ¶¶ 16–36.

The patents-in-suit indicate that all of the inventors reside either within the Northern District of California or China:

<b>U.S. Patent No.</b>	<b>Alleged Inventors</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>10,877,233</b>	Yifei Dai	Shanghai, China (China)
	Yattung Lam	Palo Alto, California (N.D. Cal.)
	Rajan Pai	San Jose, California (N.D. Cal.)
<b>11,012,252</b>	Yattung Lam	San Jose, California (N.D. Cal.)
	Baohua Chen	Xiamen, China (China)
<b>11,032,111</b>	Junqing Sun	Fremont, California (N.D. Cal.)
	Haoli Qian	Fremont, California (N.D. Cal.)

Accordingly, the patents-in-suit were likely conceived and reduced to practice within the Northern District of California (and abroad) and key (party and potentially non-party) witnesses, documents and evidence relating to the patents-in-suit, as maintained by the inventors, are within the Northern District of California.

Credo Semiconductor Inc. is a California corporation and maintains its principal place of business within the Northern District of California at 110 Rio Robles, San Jose, California 95134. Dkt. 9 ¶ 3. While Credo Semiconductor Inc. may be registered to do business in Texas, Credo Semiconductor Inc. does not allege that it owns any real property in Texas; that it owns, leases, or maintains any tangible personal property, including any documents or electronic data repositories, in Texas; nor does it allege that it has any employees, employee representatives or agents in Texas, pays any property or income taxes in Texas, or has any places of business, mailing addresses, bank accounts, or telephone listings in Texas.

Credo Semiconductor Inc. is a subsidiary of Credo Technology Group Ltd. Credo Technology Group Ltd. is a Cayman Islands corporation and maintains its principal place of business at Ugland House, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands KY1-1104. Dkt. 9 ¶ 4. Credo Technology Group Holding Ltd.—formed as an exempted company under the laws of the Cayman Islands in September 2014—directly owns Credo Technology Group Ltd., which owns, directly and indirectly, all of the shares of its subsidiaries in mainland China, Hong Kong, and the United

States.<sup>1</sup> Credo Technology Group Ltd. does not allege that it transacts business directly with any individual or entity anywhere—*i.e.*, it does not develop, make, sell, or distribute any product or services. Credo Technology Group Ltd. does not allege that it owns any real property in Texas; owns, leases, or maintains any tangible personal property, including any documents or electronic data repositories, in Texas; has any employees, employee representatives or agents in Texas, pays any property or income taxes in Texas, that it has any places of business, mailing addresses, bank accounts, or telephone listings in Texas; nor that it is registered with the Texas Secretary of State to transact business in Texas.

Credo’s own website indicates that a plurality of the members of Credo’s leadership team (which team appears to include the company’s executive leadership team, engineering team, operations team, and sales, marketing, and business development team) appear to reside, work, or reside and work within the Northern District of California. *See* Declaration of Eric S. Lucas (“Lucas Decl.”), ¶ 2, submitted herewith as Ex. 1. Certain of these individuals hold overlapping titles at Credo Semiconductor Inc. and Credo Technology Group Holding Ltd. *Compare* Ex. A to the Lucas Decl. *with* <https://credosemi.com/company/leadership/> (last visited July 7, 2025).

#### **B. Defendant Volex plc Lacks Any Material Nexus with Texas**

Volex is a public limited company organized under the laws of England and Wales. *See* Declaration of Jon Boaden (“Boaden Decl.”), submitted herewith as Ex. 2, ¶ 3. Volex is not licensed to do or conduct business in Texas and has never sold the accused products in Texas. *Id.*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Credo Technology Group Holding Ltd, Form 10-Q at 11 (available at [https://s205.g4cdn.com/511065572/files/doc\\_financials/2025/q3/c2f604eb-4eee-4cd0-9220-25196dd6d3fc.pdf](https://s205.g4cdn.com/511065572/files/doc_financials/2025/q3/c2f604eb-4eee-4cd0-9220-25196dd6d3fc.pdf)); *see also* Credo’s Corporate Disclosure (Dkt. 4) (“Credo Technology Group Ltd. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Credo Technology Group Holding Ltd., which is a publicly held corporation. Credo Technology Group Holding Ltd. has no parent corporation.... Credo Semiconductor Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Credo Technology Group Ltd.”).

¶¶ 5, 7. Volex does not maintain any office, phone numbers, or mailing address in Texas, nor owns property in Texas. *Id.*, ¶¶ 8–9. Volex is not registered with the Texas Secretary of State to transact business in Texas. *Id.*, ¶ 6. Volex’s technical and sales witnesses reside in the United Kingdom (and one resides in Australia). *Id.*, ¶ 10. For example, Volex believes the following witnesses have discoverable information: Jim Logan, a Business Development Director and Jon Boaden, Group CFO (both of whom reside in the United Kingdom); and John Molloy, Group COO (who resides in Australia). *Id.* Further, Volex anticipates producing in this litigation the following types of documents, all of which are maintained in the United Kingdom: P&L statements, corporate documents, and organizational charts. *Id.*, ¶ 11.

Manufacturing and the development efforts relating to the accused products are performed by one of Volex’s subsidiaries in Jiangsu Province, China—Volex Interconnect Systems (Suzhou) Co. Ltd. (“Volex Interconnect”), a non-party to the suit. *Id.*, ¶ 12. The remainder of the manufacturing efforts relating to the accused products are performed by PT Volex Indonesia, another of Volex’s subsidiaries. *Id.* Accordingly, key manufacturing personnel and other potential witnesses with knowledge of the manufacturing and development efforts of the accused products are employed by Volex Interconnect, in Jiangsu Province, China. For example, a key Volex witness is Clement Guo, a Director for High-Speed Products at Volex Interconnect, who resides in China. *Id.*, ¶ 13. Further, Volex anticipates the parties requesting in this litigation the following types of Volex Interconnect documents and evidence that are maintained in China: manufacturing specifications, standards, raw material costs, and shipping documents. *Id.*, ¶ 14.

Additional witnesses and English-language technical documents and other evidence relating to Credo’s infringement allegations, including relating to customer and sales information, are maintained by Volex’s U.S. sales-related subsidiary—Volex, Inc. (another non-party to the

suit)—a Massachusetts corporation, with its mailing address in California. *Id.*, ¶¶ 15–16. For example, the following Volex Inc. witnesses likely have technical information and customer and sales information and reside in California: (1) Adugodi Raman Srihamsha (Vice President of Global Engineering); (2) Connor Pingree (Sales Director); and (3) Luis Cervantes (engineering business unit manager). *Id.*, ¶ 17. Further, Volex anticipates the parties requesting in this litigation the following types of documents and evidence that are maintained in California by Volex Inc.: manuals, standards, customer lists, and sales information. *Id.*, ¶ 18.

**C. The Relevant Third-Party Supplier, ██████████, Lacks Any Material Nexus with Texas**

Third-party ██████████ (“████████”), which is headquartered in the Northern District of California, supplies the semiconductor chips that are used in the accused products to provide the functionality to which Credo’s infringement allegations point. *See id.*, ¶ 19. ██████████ therefore has relevant witnesses, documents, and other evidence within the Northern District of California regarding Credo’s alleged infringement. For example, the following ██████████ witnesses, which Volex believes likely have information relating to those semiconductor chips, reside and/or work within the Northern District of California: (1) ██████████ (Vice President of Global Sales) and (2) ██████████ (Senior Director of Product Management). *See id.*, ¶ 20. Further, Volex anticipates the parties requesting in this litigation the following types of ██████████ documents and evidence that seem likely to be maintained within the Northern District of California: manufacturing specifications, shipping documents, raw material costs, and product samples. *See id.*, ¶ 21.

### III. ARGUMENT

This Court has the authority to transfer any civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) “[f]or the convenience of the parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice . . . to any other district or division where it might have been brought.”

The Section 1404(a) analysis begins with an assessment of whether the case “might have been brought” in the destination venue. 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); *see also In re Volkswagen AG*, 371 F.3d 201, 203 (5th Cir. 2004) (“*Volkswagen I*”). If so, the Court next evaluates “all relevant factors to determine whether or not on balance the litigation would more conveniently proceed and the interests of justice be better served by transfer to a different forum.” *Peteet v. Dow Chem. Co.*, 868 F.2d 1428, 1436 (5th Cir. 1989) (quoting 15 Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Edward H. Cooper, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3847 (1986)).

The convenience determination turns on an assessment of “a number of private and public interest factors, none of which are given dispositive weight.” *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 203. The private interest factors are: “(1) the relative ease of access to sources of proof; (2) the availability of compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses; (3) the cost of attendance for willing witnesses; and (4) all other practical problems that make trial of a case easy, expeditious and inexpensive.” *In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.*, 545 F.3d 304, 315 (5th Cir. 2008) (“*Volkswagen II*”) (quoting *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 203). “The public interest factors are: (1) the administrative difficulties flowing from court congestion; (2) the local interest in having localized interests decided at home; (3) the familiarity of the forum with the law that will govern the case; and (4) the avoidance of unnecessary problems of conflict of laws or in the application of foreign law.” *Id.*

Here, the factors either clearly support transferring this action to California, where this action could have been initiated in the first instance, or are neutral, and thus do not suggest that transfer would be improper. The motion to transfer should be granted accordingly.

**A. Credo Could Have Sued Volex in the Northern District of California**

The Northern District of California would have had subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction over Volex and would have been an appropriate venue in which this suit could have been brought. *See Capella Photonics, Inc. v. Infinera Corp.*, 2021 WL 518478, at \*1 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 10, 2021) (Gilstrap, C. J.) (“The question of whether a suit ‘might have been brought’ in the transferee forum encompasses subject matter jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction, and propriety of venue . . . . Only if this statutory requirement is met should the Court determine whether convenience warrants a transfer of the case.”).

First, there is no doubt that the Northern District of California would have subject matter jurisdiction over this actions because “[a]ll United States District Courts have subject matter jurisdiction over any civil action arising under United States patent law and under federal law generally,” and thus it cannot be “disputed that the Northern District of California would have subject-matter jurisdiction over this case.” *Id.*

Second, with respect to personal jurisdiction, Volex notes that it has a subsidiary headquartered in California, and thus more logically expected to have been haled into court in California than in Texas, where it does not conduct business. Moreover, to the extent Credo argues that this Court has personal jurisdiction over Volex based on Volex devices being in the stream of U.S. commerce such that they could be expected to end up in any state, the same rationale supporting such a finding holds for the Northern District of California. Thus, if this Court had personal jurisdiction at the time of commencement of suit, the Northern District of California would also have had jurisdiction over Volex based on a similar theory. *See, e.g., Orbital Australia Pty Ltd. v. Daimler AG*, 2015 WL 4042178, at \*2–5 (E.D. Va. July 1, 2015) (granting transfer to the Eastern District of Michigan and finding that if jurisdiction with respect to a foreign defendant was appropriate in Virginia, it would have been appropriate in Michigan for the same reasons).

Last, to assess venue, this Court must look to the parameters of 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3), because Volex is not a resident of the United States. *See Allstate Ins. Co. v. Toshner*, 2024 WL 4783844, at \*2 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 28, 2024) (assessing venue of proposed transferee court pursuant to Section 1391), *report and recommendation adopted*, 2024 WL 4780883 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 13, 2024). Venue in the Northern District of California would be proper had Volex been sued there in the first instance, because Volex is not a resident of the United States, and therefore, may be sued in any judicial district. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(3).

Accordingly, this suit could have proceeded against Volex in the Northern District of California, and this Court may reach the subsequent question of convenience. *See Optimum Power Solutions LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 794 F. Supp. 2d 696, 700 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 22, 2011).

**B. The Private Interest Factors Clearly Favor Transfer**

All of the private interest factors that the Fifth Circuit has instructed be considered in the “convenience” analysis when assessing a motion to transfer pursuant to Section 1404 weigh in favor of granting Volex’s motion to transfer. These factors—(1) the relative ease of access to sources of proof; (2) the availability of compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses; (3) the cost of attendance for willing witnesses; and (4) all other practical problems that make trial of a case easy, expeditious and inexpensive—respect the “private interest of the litigant” and all go to assessing the “advantages and obstacles to fair trial” and weigh in favor of transferring this action to the Northern District of California, where critical party and non-party witnesses are situated. *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert*, 330 U.S. 501, 507 (1947); *see Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*, 454 U.S. 235, 241 (1981) (applying *Gilbert* factors in assessing Section 1404 motion).

**1. More Sources of Proof Are Available in the Northern District of California than in this District**

The “access to sources of proof” factor “relates to the ease of access to non-witness evidence, such as documents and other physical evidence[.]” *In re Apple, Inc.*, 979 F.3d 1332, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (citing *Volkswagen II*, 545 F.3d at 316–18). “The critical inquiry ‘is relative ease of access, not absolute ease of access.’” *In re TOA Techs., Inc.*, 543 F. App’x 1006, 1009 (Fed. Cir. 2013) (citing *In re Radmax, Ltd.*, 720 F.3d 285, 288 (5th Cir. 2013)). Here, the most relevant U.S.-based sources of proof will be in California (not Texas) and are predominantly within the Northern District of California.

It is in the Northern District of California that Credo Semiconductor Inc. is both incorporated and maintains its principal place of business. Dkt. 9 ¶ 3. It is in the Northern District of California where a plurality of Credo Semiconductor Inc.’s senior leadership work or reside (or do both). *See supra* § II.A. It is in the Northern District of California that four of the six inventors of the patents-in-suit reside as well. *See supra* § II.A. It is in California that Volex maintains a relevant subsidiary and there exists evidence related to its North American sales. *See supra* § II.B. And it is in the Northern District of California that Volex’s component supplier is incorporated and where key witnesses also reside and/or work. *See supra* § II.C. As noted, all of the documents maintained by Volex that are relevant to this proceeding are located within the United Kingdom, as are its relevant witnesses (and Australia), but non-party witnesses and documents from its U.S. affiliate are in California. *See supra* § II.B. “Given the relevant events and circumstances giving rise to these infringement claims, it is unsurprising that many identified sources of proof and likely witnesses are in Northern California and none in the [Eastern] District of Texas. . . . [N]ot a single witness has been identified as residing in or near the [Eastern] District of Texas.” *In re Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.*, 2 F.4th 1371, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (reversing denial of Section 1404 transfer).

Where, as here, “[Defendant] does not maintain any material documents in the Eastern District of Texas and neither does the plaintiff” and “there are no sources of proof in the Eastern District of Texas, and there are sources of proof in the [Northern District of California], . . . this factor weighs in favor of transfer to the [Northern District of California].” *Balthaser Online, Inc. v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 2011 WL 1526964, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 20, 2011); *see also Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Blackboard Inc.*, 2020 WL 4578702, at \*3 (W.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) (finding that “the proximity of potential sources of proof and of relevant third parties to the case” supports transfer”); *JetBlue Airways Corp. v. Helferich Patent Licensing, LLC*, 960 F. Supp. 2d 383, 400 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) (“In a patent case, the locus of operative facts usually lies where either the patent-in-suit or the allegedly infringing product was designed, developed, and produced.”).

**2. Witnesses Are Available Through Compulsory Process in the Northern District of California, But Not in This District**

When considering transfer for convenience, “the Court must consider the availability of compulsory process to secure the attendance of witnesses, particularly non-party witnesses whose attendance may need to be secured by a court order.” *Duckworth v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 2022 WL 2070610, at \*2 (E.D. Tex. June 8, 2022). “When a greater number of key non-party witnesses could be subpoenaed to attend a trial in the potential transferee forum, but not in the current forum, this factor favors transfer.” *Camatic Proprietary Ltd. v. Irwin Seating Co.*, 2017 WL 2362029, at \*4 (N.D. Tex. May 31, 2017) (citing *Internet Mach. LLC v. Alienware Corp.*, 2011 WL 2292961, at \*6 (E.D. Tex. June 7, 2011)). That is because live testimony will be crucial for evaluating the credibility of the witness. *See Aguilar-Ayala v. Ruiz*, 973 F.2d 411, 419 (5th Cir. 1992) (“Only through live cross-examination can the jury fully appreciate the strength or weakness of the witness’ testimony, by closely observing the witness’ demeanor, expressions, and intonations.”).

Here, numerous key individual third-party witnesses, including potential inventor witnesses and witnesses from [REDACTED] having relevant knowledge regarding Credo's infringement allegations in this action, are within the Northern District of California's subpoena power, but not within this Court's subpoena power. *See supra* §§ II.A, C. Indeed, Volex is unaware of any third-party witness relevant to this litigation that is subject to the subpoena power of this District. Accordingly, this factor strongly weighs in favor of transfer.

**3. It Would Be Far More Convenient For Witnesses if this Action Were Transferred to the Northern District of California**

The “single most important factor in [the] transfer analysis” is the convenience—monetary and personal—for willing witnesses. *In re Juniper Networks, Inc.*, 14 F.4th 1313, 1318–19 (Fed. Cir. 2021); *see also Hammond Dev. Int'l, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 2020 WL 6136783, at \*3 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 30, 2020) (same). “When the distance between an existing venue for trial of a matter and a proposed venue under § 1404(a) is more than 100 miles, the factor of inconvenience to witnesses increases in direct relationship to the additional distance to be traveled.” *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 204–05. The Court must consider not only monetary costs witnesses may bear, “but also the personal costs associated with being away from work, family, and community.” *Volkswagen II*, 545 F.3d at 317; *see also In re Google, LLC*, 2021 WL 4427899, at \*4 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 27, 2021) (similar).

This factor overwhelmingly favors transfer to the Northern District of California because the vast majority of U.S.-based party and third-party witnesses are located in the Northern District of California, or California more generally, rendering the cost of traveling to this District—monetary and personal—considerably higher than traveling to (or staying in) the Northern District of California. As noted, Credo has intimate connections to the Northern District of California both with respect to its headquarters and the locations of its key employees, *see supra* § II.A; many of

the inventors reside in the Northern District of California, *see supra* § II.A; and key defense witnesses (including key third party witnesses of the defendant’s U.S.-based subsidiary and component supplier) are based in California (including within the Northern District of California), *see supra* §§ II.B–C.

As the Fifth Circuit has recognized, it is an “‘obvious conclusion’ that it is more convenient for witnesses to testify at home and that ‘additional distance means additional travel time; additional travel time increases the probability for meal and lodging expenses; and additional travel time with overnight stays increases the time which these fact witnesses must be away from their regular employment.’” *Volkswagen II*, 545 F.3d at 317 (quoting *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 205). Maintaining this action in this District would require these key witnesses to be far away from their families and regular employment for days at a time. In contrast, transferring this action to the Northern District of California, “where more witnesses could testify without leaving their homes or their regular places of business,” would be far more convenient. *In re Pandora Media, LLC*, 2021 WL 4772805, at \*6 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 13, 2021) (citing *In re TracFone Wireless, Inc.*, 852 F. App’x 537, 539–40 (Fed. Cir. 2021)).

#### **4. Transfer Would Not Cause Any Practical Problems for the Northern District of California or this Court**

“Practical problems [with transfer] include those that are rationally based on judicial economy.” *Optimum Power Solutions*, 794 F. Supp. 2d at 702. Such factors include the possibility that transfer would cause duplicative litigation, *id.*, whether the party requesting transfer delayed in making such an application, and the impact of transfer on the case schedule, *see Voxpath RS, LLC v. LG Elecs. U.S.A., Inc.*, 2012 WL 194370, at \*6 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 23, 2012) (Gilstrap, J.).

Here, there are no practical problems with transferring this case because the case has just begun. Discovery has not started, the parties have not yet exchanged initial disclosures, and Credo

has yet to serve its preliminary infringement contentions. Indeed, this Court has barely been burdened by this case. Thus, this factor too favors transfer.

**C. The Public Interest Factors Either Favor Transfer, or Do Not Weigh Against Transfer**

“Factors of public interest” assess the impact of maintaining a litigation in a particular forum on the broader public. *Gilbert*, 330 U.S. at 507. The public interest factors that the Fifth Circuit has indicated should be considered—(1) the administrative difficulties flowing from court congestion; (2) the local interest in having localized interests decided at home; (3) the familiarity of the forum with the law that will govern the case; and (4) the avoidance of unnecessary problems of conflict of laws or in the application of foreign law—either support transfer or are neutral.

**1. This District Is as Congested as the Northern District of California**

When considering transfer for convenience, the Court must evaluate “the speed with which a case can come to trial and be resolved.” *In re Genentech, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1338, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2009). However, when “several relevant factors weigh in favor of transfer and others are neutral, then the speed of the transferee district court should not alone outweigh all of those other factors.” *Id.* That is because the speed at which a case goes to trial “appears to be the most speculative” and “case-disposition statistics may not always tell the whole story.” *Id.*

Here, the median time to trial is somewhat shorter in this District—21 months (630 days), *see* Ex. B to Lucas Decl.—than in the Northern District of California—26 months (781 days), *see* Ex. C to Lucas Decl. But because of the speculative nature of the factor and the small difference in time to trial between this District and the Northern District of California, this factor should be found to be neutral.

## 2. This District Does Not Have a Local Interest in Resolving this Case

When considering transfer for convenience, this Court must evaluate whether this District has a local interest in deciding this case; in other words, whether there are “localized interests” present in this forum. *Volkswagen II*, 545 F.3d at 317. This Court must evaluate whether there are “significant connections between a particular venue and the events that gave rise to a suit.” *Apple*, 979 F.3d at 1345 (citing *In re Acer Am. Corp.*, 626 F.3d 1252, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (emphasis omitted)). This factor is particularly important: the Fifth Circuit has emphasized that “jury duty is a burden that ought not to be imposed upon the people of a community which has no relation to the litigation.” *Volkswagen I*, 371 F.3d at 206. And, here, the Northern District of California has a much greater interest than this District.

There is no connection between this District and Credo’s acts of purported invention or the alleged acts of infringement; rather this connection lies within the Northern District of California, where Credo resides, along with a majority of the inventors listed in the patents-in-suit, various key Credo executives, and the supplier of a key component for the accused products. *See supra* §§ II.A, C. The local interest possessed by the Northern District of California is strong because the action “calls into question the work and reputation of several individuals residing” there. *In re Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.*, 587 F.3d 1333, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *see also Apple*, 979 F.3d at 1345 (“The district court also misapplied the law to the facts by failing to give weight to the ‘significant connections between [the Northern District of California] and the events that gave rise to a suit.’”) (quoting *Acer*, 626 F.3d at 1256).

Moreover, “[t]he fact that infringement is alleged in the [Eastern] District of Texas gives [this District] no more of a local interest than the Northern District of California or any other venue.” *Samsung*, 2 F.4th at 1380. In fact, Credo alleges that Volex “infringed and caused infringement of the Asserted Patents in Texas and within this District *through a nationwide*

*channel of distribution in the United States.*” Dkt. 9 ¶ 8 (emphasis added). In other words, Credo effectively concedes that the interest in having this case resolved in the Eastern District of Texas is just as great as having the case resolved in any judicial district of this nation.

Thus, Credo’s infringement allegations in this District are overwhelmed by the Northern District of California’s significant local interest in deciding local issues of alleged infringement at home. *Cf. In re TOA Techs.*, 543 F. App’x at 1009 (“[T]he Northern District of Ohio has a local interest in deciding this matter. . . . [T]here is no apparent connection between this case and the Eastern District of Texas for the fact that the accused products are sold there.”).

**3. This District and Northern District of California Are Equally Capable of Assessing the Applicable Law**

Credo alleges patent law claims only. *See generally* Dkt. 9. Both this District and the Northern District of California are “equally capable of construing and applying patent law.” *Camatic*, 2017 WL 2362029, at \*7. Therefore, the third public interest factor is neutral. *Id.*

**4. There Will Be No Conflict of Patent Law as Applied Between this District and the Northern District of California**

The final public interest factor considers the avoidance of unnecessary problems of conflicts of law or the application of foreign law. “[F]ederal district courts are of equal jurisdiction, and the national patent system, where all appeals go to the Federal Circuit, eliminates the risk of conflicting circuit precedent.” *Id.* Therefore, the fourth public interest factor is neutral. *Id.*

**IV. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Volex respectfully requests that this Court transfer this action to the Northern District of California.

Dated: July 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David Whittlesey

David P. Whittlesey

Texas Bar No. 00791920

david.whittlesey@aoshearman.com

Abdul Althebaity

Texas Bar No. 24120683

abdul.althebaity@aoshearman.com

ALLEN OVERY SHEARMAN STERLING US LLP

300 W. 6th Street, Suite 2250

Austin, TX 78701

Telephone: (512) 647-1900

Thomas R. Makin (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

thomas.makin@aoshearman.com

Eris S. Lucas (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

eric.lucas@aoshearman.com

David J. Cooperberg

david.cooperberg@aoshearman.com

Adi A. Williams (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

adi.williams@aoshearman.com

ALLEN OVERY SHEARMAN STERLING US LLP

599 Lexington Avenue

New York, NY 10022

Telephone: (212) 848-4000

**COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT VOLEX PLC**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule CV-5, I hereby certify that, on July 7, 2025, all counsel of record, who have appeared in this case, are being served with a copy of the foregoing by email.

/s/ David Whittlesey  
David P. Whittlesey

**CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORIZATION TO FILE UNDER SEAL**

I certify that a motion to seal this document is being filed contemporaneously pursuant to Local Rule CV-5(a)(7) and CV-7(k).

/s/ David Whittlesey  
David P. Whittlesey

**CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

Pursuant to Local Rule CV-7(i), I hereby certify that, (i) counsel for defendant has complied with the meet and confer requirement imposed by Local Rule CV-7(h) having conferred with opposing counsel about this motion on July 2, 2025, by telephone and included Eric S. Lucas and Brian Livedalen, and (ii) that this motion is opposed by plaintiffs. No agreement could be reached since while defendant believes that transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) is advisable, plaintiffs do not.

*/s/David Whittlesey* \_\_\_\_\_  
David P. Whittlesey