

1 Douglas R. Young (Bar No. 073248)  
[dyoung@fbm.com](mailto:dyoung@fbm.com)  
 2 C. Brandon Wisoff (Bar No. 121930)  
[bwisoff@fbm.com](mailto:bwisoff@fbm.com)  
 3 Farella Braun + Martel LLP  
 235 Montgomery St., 17th Floor  
 4 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 954-4400  
 5 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480

6 James A. Wilson (*Pro hac vice*)  
[jawilson@vorys.com](mailto:jawilson@vorys.com)  
 7 Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease LLP  
 52 E. Gay St.  
 8 Columbus, OH 43215  
 Telephone: (614) 464-6400  
 9 Facsimile: (614) 464-6350

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
 OCLC ONLINE COMPUTER  
 11 LIBRARY CENTER, INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14  
 15 SKYRIVER TECHNOLOGY  
 SOLUTIONS, LLC, a California limited  
 16 liability company, and INNOVATIVE  
 INTERFACES, INC, a California  
 17 corporation, ,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 OCLC ONLINE COMPUTER LIBRARY  
 CENTER, Inc., an Ohio non-profit  
 21 corporation,,

22 Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03305-JSW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER TRANSFERRING  
 CASE TO THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
 OHIO**

Date: October 29, 2010  
 Time: 9:00 a.m.  
 Judge: Judge: Jeffrey S. White  
 Courtroom: 11, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor

[28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a)]

1 The Court, having considered the motion of Defendant OCLC Online Computer Library  
2 Center, Inc. (hereafter “Defendant” or “OCLC”) requesting transfer of this case to the Southern  
3 District of Ohio under 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a) finds that:

4 1. This case could have brought in the Southern District of Ohio as that court  
5 possesses proper subject matter jurisdiction over this action, personal jurisdiction over OCLC,  
6 and the events giving rise to the claim occurred in that forum;

7 2. The convenience of the parties and witnesses and access to relevant evidence is  
8 served by a transfer to the Southern District of Ohio, which is the location of the principal places  
9 of business of OCLC and the principal location of the marketing, development, and sale of the  
10 accused services;

11 3. A California court has little interest in this controversy, whereas an Ohio court has  
12 a demonstrable interest in the controversy; and

13 4. Plaintiff does not have a strong interest in maintaining this suit in the Northern  
14 District of California.

15  
16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT

17 This case is transferred to the Eastern Division of the Southern District of Ohio located in  
18 Columbus, Ohio.

19 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2010  
20

21  
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Jeffrey S. White  
United States District Court  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28