

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

OPINIONLAB, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LODSYS, LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 11-CV-4015

The Hon. Ronald Guzman

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO TAKE DISCOVERY
LIMITED TO THE ISSUES OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

Plaintiff OpinionLab, Inc. (“OpinionLab”) respectfully requests leave to take discovery of Defendant Lodsys, LLC (“Lodsys”) prior to briefing its opposition to Lodsys’s pending motion to dismiss, limited to the issues of personal jurisdiction and venue addressed therein. Such limited discovery is warranted here because publicly available information contradicts the averments in Lodsys’s motion to dismiss, and the declaration of Mark Small filed in support of that motion.¹ Specifically, OpinionLab seeks narrowly-tailored written discovery and deposition testimony directed to the issues of personal jurisdiction and venue. In support of this motion, OpinionLab states as follows:

1. On June 13, 2011, OpinionLab filed a complaint for declaratory judgment of non-infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,999,908, 7,133,834, 7,222,078 and 7,620,565 (the “Asserted

¹ Lodsys also moved to dismiss the complaints filed by Declaratory Judgment Plaintiffs The New York Times Company, LivePerson, Inc., and ForeSee Results, Inc. in the following related declaratory judgment actions, which have been reassigned to the Honorable Ronald Guzman: *The New York Times Company v. Lodsys, LLC*, No. 11-cv-4004; *LivePerson, Inc. v. Lodsys, LLC*, No. 11-cv-4088; and *Foresee Results, Inc., LLC v. Lodsys, LLC*, No. 11-cv-3886. These Plaintiffs agree to work together in a joint discovery effort with OpinionLab on the issues of personal jurisdiction and venue raised by Lodsys’s respective motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and venue; similar motions have therefore been filed in each of these co-pending cases.

Patents”). Defendant Lodsys is a non-practicing entity, which is in the business of licensing and enforcing the Asserted Patents. To date, a substantial portion of such licensing and enforcement activity has been undertaken or directed by Lodsys’s CEO Mark Small. In bringing its Complaint, OpinionLab relied on a public representation made by Mark Small – namely, that in his capacity as the CEO of Lodsys, he resides in the Greater Chicago Area.

2. On July 5, 2011, Lodsys moved to dismiss OpinionLab’s complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue. (Dkt. 15). Lodsys generally asserts that it has insufficient contacts with the State of Illinois or this District that constitute a basis for personal jurisdiction or venue. However, Lodsys makes no particular affirmative statements in support of its assertion. Instead, Lodsys has offers a conclusory declaration provided by Mark Small which fails to include documentary support, and conflicts with Mr. Small’s own prior public representation.

3. Based on Mr. Small’s declaration, the factual record has been made unclear as to whether he resides or does business in Wisconsin, Illinois or both. Thus, the factual record is ambiguous, at best, as to whether jurisdiction and venue are proper in this jurisdiction. Accordingly, the Court should permit OpinionLab an opportunity to investigate the purported factual bases for Lodsys’s motion, and to present the facts that will confirm the appropriateness of asserting jurisdiction over Lodsys in Illinois.

4. Courts in this District regularly allow discovery on jurisdictional issues. *See, e.g., Sitrick v. Freehand Systems, Inc.*, No. 02-CV-1568, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5292, at *2 (N.D. Ill. March 31, 2004) (“the Court allowed Sitrick to conduct discovery on the issue of jurisdiction alone”); *P.H. Int’l Trading Co. v. Christia Confeszioni S.P.A.*, No. 04-CV-903, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19191, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 24, 2004) (“the district court subsequently extended briefing

on the motion to dismiss to allow the parties to take discovery on the jurisdiction issue”); *see also Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Pension Fund v. Phencorp Reinsurance Co.*, 440 F.3d 870, 875-878 (7th Cir. 2006) (reversing dismissal and finding that district court abused discretion in denying plaintiffs request for discovery).

5. In order to obtain jurisdictional discovery, OpinionLab need only establish a *prima facie* case for personal jurisdiction. *Cent. States, Se. & Sw. Areas Pension Fund v. Phencorp Reinsur*, 440 F.3d 870, 876-77 (7th Cir. 2006) (finding that district court abused discretion in denying jurisdictional discovery, and noting that “[s]ince [plaintiff] was denied the opportunity to engage in discovery, it is not surprising that it can do little more than suggest that [defendant] currently has minimum contacts with the United States”). “In the procedural posture of a motion to dismiss a district court must accept the uncontroverted allegations in the plaintiff’s complaint as true and resolve any factual conflicts in the affidavits in the plaintiff’s favor.” *Trading Techs. Int’l*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33552 at *9 (quoting *Elecs. For Imaging*, 340 F.3d at 1349). “Generally, courts grant jurisdictional discovery if the plaintiff can show that the factual record is at least ambiguous or unclear on the jurisdiction issue.” *Ticketreserve, Inc. v. Viagogo, Inc.*, 656 F. Supp. 2d 775, 782 (N.D. Ill. 2009).

6. Here, Mr. Small’s declaration directly conflicts with his own pre-litigation public representations, upon which OpinionLab relied in its Complaint. In his LinkedIn[®] profile at the time OpinionLab filed its complaint, Mr. Small, represented that he was the CEO of Lodsyst, and that he resided in the greater Chicago area. (Ex. 1). Now, to support of Lodsyst’s litigation-driven position, Mr. Small eschews any contacts with Illinois. At the very least, Mr. Small’s representations regarding his apparent contacts with Illinois, whether past or present, provide a *prima facie* basis for allowing discovery on issues related to personal jurisdiction.

7. Furthermore, conspicuously absent from both Mr. Small's declaration and Lodsys's motion are any affirmative statements that Lodsys has not conducted business in Illinois. Instead, Mr. Small's declaration is apparently crafted to avoid providing definitive averments regarding facts central to the issues of personal jurisdiction and venue. Providing OpinionLab the opportunity to explore these issues would aid the Court in determining whether it has proper jurisdiction over Lodsys.

8. Lodsys also conspicuously fails to deny that it has agreements to license the Patents In Suit with companies residing and/or doing business in Illinois. The nature of those licensing agreements and Lodsys' relationships with companies doing business here bears on whether Lodsys has sufficient minimum contacts with the jurisdiction. *See Avocent Huntsville Corp.*, 552 F.3d at 1334 (citing *Campbell Pet Co. v. Miale*, 542 F.3d 879, 886 (Fed. Cir. 2008)) (examples of activities that may subject a defendant to jurisdiction include initiating judicial or extra-judicial patent enforcement within the forum, or entering into an exclusive license agreement or *other undertaking which imposes enforcement obligations with a party residing or regularly doing business in the forum.*") (emphasis supplied) (citation omitted). Discovery into these issues should be permitted. Accordingly, this Court should allow OpinionLab to take discovery relating to the business activities of Lodsys to ascertain the veracity of the allegations in Mr. Small's declaration and Lodsys' motion to dismiss.

9. OpinionLab should also be allowed to take discovery on the objectively baseless nature of the infringement claims in Lodsys' cease and desist letters because proof of bad faith activities directed towards residents or businesses headquartered in Illinois would support jurisdiction. *See, e.g., International Electronics, Inc. v. Human Electronics, Inc.*, 320 F. Supp. 2d 1085, 1089 (W.D. Wash. 2004).

10. OpinionLab's request for jurisdictional discovery is not made for purposes of delay, but rather to aid in the orderly resolution of Lodsyst's motion to dismiss. Evidence, exclusively in the hands of the Lodsyst and Mr. Small, will likely confirm that the Lodsyst has, itself or through its licensees and agents, the minimum contacts with the State of Illinois sufficient to find personal jurisdiction here.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, OpinionLab respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order allowing a 60-day period to conduct jurisdictional discovery. Further, OpinionLab requests that the Court enter an Order permitting OpinionLab to: (1) propound document requests, interrogatories and requests for admissions directed to the issues of personal jurisdiction and venue; and (2) depose both Mr. Small and Lodsyst through a Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deposition.

Dated: July 22, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,

OPINIONLAB, INC.

By: /s Robert J. Barz

Alan L. Barry
Robert J. Barz
K&L GATES LLP
70 West Madison #3100
Chicago, Illinois 60602

J. Michael Keyes
K&L GATES LLP
618 West Riverside Avenue #300
Spokane WA 99201
Telephone: 509.624.2100
Facsimile: 509.456.0146

Mark G. Knedeisen
K&L GATES LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff OpinionLab, Inc.