

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, NORFOLK DIVISION

Fleet Connect Solutions LLC v. Xirgo Technologies, LLC; Xirgo Holdings, Inc.; OBD Sensor Solutions LLC v. Xirgo Technologies, LLC; Xirgo Holdings, Inc.

Fleet Connect · No. Nos. 2:25-cv-712 and 2:25-cv-713 · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia denied defendants’ motions to transfer two patent infringement actions to the Northern District of Illinois and to stay the cases pending resolution of the transfer motions. The court found that the plaintiffs’ choice of forum favored transfer, while witness and party convenience were neutral. The interest of justice strongly favored retaining the related cases in Virginia to promote judicial economy and avoid inconsistent judgments.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jamar K. Walker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division
DECIDED	June 1, 2026
DOCKET	Nos. 2:25-cv-712 and 2:25-cv-713
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	In two related patent-infringement actions, defendants moved under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) to transfer the cases to the Northern District of Illinois and moved to stay the cases pending resolution of the transfer motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the discretionary, individualized, case-by-case analysis required by 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), with the movant bearing the burden to show that transfer is proper. The court considered whether the actions could have been brought in the transferee forum and, if so, weighed the plaintiff's choice of venue, witness convenience and access, party convenience, and the interest of justice.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court opinion
PARTIES	Fleet Connect Solutions LLC, OBD Sensor Solutions LLC v. Xirgo Technologies, LLC, Xirgo Holdings, Inc.

TOPICS

venue patent infringement patent law civil procedure commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure patent law patent infringement commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the patent-infringement actions could have been brought in the Northern District of Illinois under the applicable venue statutes.
2. Whether the § 1404(a) convenience and interest-of-justice factors warranted transferring the actions from the Eastern District of Virginia to the Northern District of Illinois.
3. Whether the cases should be stayed pending resolution of the transfer motions.

HOLDINGS

1. The actions could have been brought in the Northern District of Illinois because Xirgo's principal place of business was in Rolling Meadows, Illinois, within that district.
2. Transfer to the Northern District of Illinois was not warranted because, on balance, the § 1404(a) factors favored retaining the cases in the Eastern District of Virginia.
3. The motions to stay were denied as moot because the court resolved the transfer motions in the same Opinion and Order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For the reasons stated below, the motions will be DENIED.” (at 2)

“Therefore, on balance the Section 1404(a) factors weigh in the plaintiffs’ favor.” (at 13-14)

“Defendants Xirgo Technologies, LLC and Xirgo Holdings, Inc.’s motions to stay and transfer (2:25-cv-712, ECF No. 25; 2:25-cev-713, ECF No. 27) are DENIED.” (at 14)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Fleet Connect, a Texas limited liability company, asserted seven patent-infringement counts concerning wireless communication devices associated with Xirgo's fleet-management and tracking products. OBD Sensor Solutions, also formed under Texas law, asserted one patent-infringement count involving Xirgo vehicle-tracking devices and related software and applications. Xirgo's headquarters and most potentially relevant employees were in Illinois, with additional employees in Minneapolis and Reston, Virginia; the accused products and allegations in

the two actions substantially overlapped. A related patent action involving the same parties and products remained pending in the Eastern District of Virginia.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed the two patent-infringement actions in the Eastern District of Virginia on November 3, 2025. Defendants moved to transfer both cases to the Northern District of Illinois and to stay them pending determination of the transfer motions. The court analyzed the motions together and denied both the transfer and stay requests.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Stewart Organization, Inc. v. Ricoh Corp., 487 U.S. 22, 29 (1988)
- Cognitronics Imaging Systems, Inc. v. Recognition Research Inc., 83 F. Supp. 2d 689, 696 (E.D. Va. 2000)
- Virginia Innovation Sciences, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., 928 F. Supp. 2d 863, 867, 869, 870-871 (E.D. Va. 2013)
- Storage Technology Corp. v. Cisco Systems, Inc., 329 F.3d 823, 836 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
- Trustees of the Plumbers & Pipefitters National Pension Fund v. Plumbing Services, Inc., 791 F.3d 436, 444 (4th Cir. 2015)
- Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown, 564 U.S. 915, 924 (2011)
- Koh v. Microtek International, Inc., 250 F. Supp. 2d 627, 631, 633, 636-637 (E.D. Va. 2003)
- Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Toshiba Corp., 109 F. Supp. 3d 882, 896, 898, 904-905 (E.D. Va. 2015)
- GTE Wireless, Inc. v. Qualcomm, Inc., 71 F. Supp. 2d 517, 519 (E.D. Va. 1999)
- Acterna, L.L.C. v. Adtech, Inc., 129 F. Supp. 2d 936, 938-940 (E.D. Va. 2001)
- NanoEntek, Inc. v. Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc., No. 2:11-cv-427, 2011 WL 6023189, at *3 (E.D. Va. Dec. 2, 2011)
- Long v. Koninklijke Luchtvaart Maatschappij, N.V., 2024 WL 23149, at *2 (E.D. Va. Jan. 2, 2024)
- Monarch Networking Solutions LLC v. Juniper Networks, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-670, 2023 WL 11717092, at *4-*7 (E.D. Va. Oct. 3, 2023)
- Board of Trustees v. Baylor Heating & Air Conditioning, Inc., 702 F. Supp. 1253, 1260 (E.D. Va. 1988)
- Byerson v. Equifax Information Services, LLC, 467 F. Supp. 2d 627, 635 (E.D. Va. 2006)
- In re Vistaprint Ltd., 628 F.3d 1342, 1347 (Fed. Cir. 2010)
- CIVIX-DDI, LLC v. Loopnet, Inc., No. 2:12-cv-2, 2012 WL 3776688, at *7 (E.D. Va. Aug. 30, 2012)
- Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc., 769 F. Supp. 2d 991, 997 (E.D. Va. 2011)