

John P. Schnurer, Bar No. 185725  
 JSchnurer@perkinscoie.com  
 John D. Esterhay, Bar No. 282330  
 JEsterhay@perkinscoie.com  
 PERKINS COIE LLP  
 11452 El Camino Real, Suite 300  
 San Diego, California 92130-2080  
 Telephone: 858.720.5700  
 Facsimile: 858.720.5799

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 Shenzhen Gooloo E-Commerce Co., Ltd.

Alex W. Ruge, (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 aruge@sheridanross.com  
 Robert R. Brunelli (*Pro Hac Vic*)  
 RBrunelli@sheridanross.com  
 Aaron P. Bradford (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 ABradfordddford@sheridanross.com  
 SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.  
 1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
 Denver, CO 80202  
 Telephone: (303) 863-9700  
 Facsimile: (303) 863-0223

Sean A. O'Brien, Bar No. 133154  
 sao@paynefears.com  
 PAYNE & FEARS LLP  
 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100  
 Irvine, California 92614  
 Telephone: (949) 851-1100  
 Facsimile: (949) 851-1212

Attorneys for Defendant  
 Pilot, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Shenzhen Gooloo E-Commerce Co.,  
 Ltd.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PILOT, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-02219-RGK-E

**RENEWED JOINT STIPULATION  
 TO STAY CASE PENDING  
 RESOLUTION OF *INTER PARTES*  
 REVIEWS OF '653 PATENT**

Judge: Hon. R. Gary Klausner  
 Magistrate: Hon. Charles F. Eick

**EXHIBIT**

2011

JOINT STIPULATION TO STAY  
 CASE

Case No. 22-cv-02219-RGK-E

Pursuant to Local Rules 7-1 and 15, Plaintiff Shenzhen Gooloo E-Commerce Co., Ltd. (“Gooloo”) and Defendant Pilot, Inc. (“Pilot”) (collectively, the “Parties”), by and through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. The parties previously filed a joint stipulation requesting that the Court grant the same relief herein requested on December 28, 2022. (ECF No. 90).

2. On January 3, 2023, the Court denied the requested stay as premature stating:

The Court deems the stipulation premature because the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's ("PTAB") decision on one of the IPRs, PTAB Case No. IPR2021-01232, is imminent. (See *id.* at 2.) The result of that ruling, along with any involved party's decision to appeal the ruling to the Federal Circuit, may inform the Court's decision regarding a stay.

Accordingly, the Stipulation is **DENIED without prejudice**. The parties may file a renewed stipulation once the PTAB rules on the outstanding IPR and any appeal has been filed. (ECF No. 93).

3. The actions identified by the Court have now occurred, and the Parties therefore present this renewed joint stipulation.

4. The Parties are currently engaged in discovery. Fact discovery is scheduled to close on February 10, 2023.

5. Gooloo's Complaint is focused on issues related to invalidity and infringement of the '653 Patent. In particular, Gooloo seeks a declaratory judgment of non-infringement claims 1-20 of the '653 Patent (ECF No. 30 ¶¶ 104-115); declaratory judgment of invalidity of claims 7-20 of the '653 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (*Id.* ¶¶ 116-125); declaratory judgment of invalidity of claims 1 and 3-20 of the '653 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (*Id.* ¶¶ 126-137); declaratory judgment of invalidity of claims 4, 10, and 13 of the '653 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for

1 lack of written description (*Id.* ¶¶ 138-159); and declaratory judgment of invalidity  
2 of claims 1-6 of the '653 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 112(a) for lack of enablement  
3 (*Id.* ¶¶ 160-169).

4 6. Nearly all of the claims at issue in these five counts have been found  
5 invalid by the United States Patent and Trademark Office Patent Trial and Appeal  
6 Board ("PTAB"). These decisions are on appeal before the United States Court of  
7 Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

8 7. On April 7, 2021, non-party The NOCO Company, Inc. ("NOCO")  
9 filed a Petition for *Inter Partes Review* of U.S. Patent No. 10,046,653 before the  
10 PTAB challenging nearly every claim of the '653 Patent at issue in this litigation,  
11 docketed as PTAB Case No. IPR2021-00777. On October 5, 2021, the PTAB  
12 instituted *inter partes review* of the challenged claims ("NOCO IPR"). On October  
13 3, 2022, the PTAB held in a final written decision that all but one of the challenged  
14 claims were unpatentable (i.e. invalid). On December 5, 2022, Pilot filed a notice  
15 of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. That appeal  
16 is pending as U.S. Federal Circuit Case No. 23-1234.

17 8. On July 16, 2021, non-party Shenzhen Chic Electronics Co., Ltd.,  
18 ("Shenzhen Chic") filed a Petition for *Inter Partes Review* of U.S. Patent No.  
19 10,046,653 before the PTAB challenging all but one claim of the '653 Patent,  
20 docketed as PTAB Case No. IPR2021-01232. This Petition for *Inter Partes Review*  
21 encompassed additional claims not challenged in the NOCO IPR. On January 14,  
22 2022, the PTAB instituted *inter partes review* of the challenged claims ("Shenzen  
23 Chic IPR"). On October 12, 2022, the PTAB heard oral argument. On January 9,  
24 2023, the PTAB again held in a final written decision that all but one of the  
25 challenged claims were unpatentable (i.e. invalid). On January 10, 2023, Pilot filed  
26 a notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.  
27 That appeal is pending but has not yet been given a case number.  
28

1           9.     The final written decisions in the two IPRs each hold all challenged  
2 claims invalid with the sole exception of Claim 3 of the ‘653 Patent. Claim 3 is  
3 subject to a claim construction by the PTAB that is disputed on appeal.

4           10.    The parties agree that there is good cause for a stay of this action  
5 pending the conclusion of the Federal Circuit appeals of NOCO’s IPR in Case No.  
6 23-1234 as well as of Shenzhen Chic’s IPR, Case No. IPR2021-01232. Gooloo is  
7 asserting claims for a declaratory judgment of invalidity of the ‘653 patent, and  
8 such claims will be materially impacted—and perhaps even rendered moot—by any  
9 decision of the PTAB and/or Federal Circuit in the pending IPR proceedings and  
10 their appeals. Thus, allowing these proceedings to conclude before further litigating  
11 this case will both simplify this proceeding by resolving or substantially advancing  
12 issues in dispute, such as claim construction and invalidity of claims of the ‘653  
13 patent, as well as create judicial efficiency by postponing further activity until after  
14 the Federal Circuit has ruled on these issues. A stay may also prevent potentially  
15 inconsistent determinations of validity on the same claims of the ‘653 Patent. The  
16 parties expect that the stay will be in place approximately one year, as the Federal  
17 Circuit’s median time for appeals from the PTAB has historically been  
18 approximately 11 months.

19           11.    A district court “has broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident  
20 to its power to control its own docket.” *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997).  
21 For example, a district court “may, with propriety, find it is efficient for its own  
22 docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a stay of an action before it,  
23 pending resolution of independent proceedings which bear upon the case.” *Leyva v.*  
24 *Certified Grocers of California, Ltd.*, 593 F.2d 857, 863 (9th Cir. 1979). In such  
25 cases, the court “need not find that two cases possess identical issues; a finding that  
26 the issues are substantially similar is sufficient to support a stay.” *Moore v.*  
27 *Universal Prot. Serv., LP*, No. EDCV 19-2124 JGB (SPx), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
28

1 88220, at \*8 (C.D. Cal. May 15, 2020) (citing *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248,  
2 254 (1936).

3 12. In the context of *inter partes* review proceedings, courts in this district  
4 primarily consider three factors: “(1) whether discovery is complete and a trial date  
5 has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the  
6 case; and (3) whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical  
7 disadvantage to the nonmoving party.” See *Pause Commers., Inc. v. Hulu, Inc.*, No.  
8 2:21-cv-02302-RGK-KES, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201641, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. June  
9 24, 2021). However, the inquiry on whether to grant a stay encompasses the totality  
10 of the circumstances. *Id.*

11 13. Discovery is not complete and, although a trial date has been set,  
12 dispositive motions have not been filed. Fact discovery does not close until  
13 February 10, 2023, and the trial is scheduled for May 9, 2023. (ECF No. 66.)  
14 Although the parties have engaged in initial discovery efforts, a significant amount  
15 of discovery remains—for example, no depositions have been conducted—and the  
16 parties have not filed motions for summary judgment. The Court has also not  
17 started the claim construction process. This factor favors a stay. See, e.g.,  
18 *Fulfillium, Inc. v. ReShape Med., LLC*, No. 2:17-cv-08419-RGK-PLA, 2018 U.S.  
19 Dist. LEXIS 229793, at \*4-5 (C.D. Cal. June 4, 2018) (finding this factor weighed  
20 slightly in favor of stay where a significant amount of discovery remained and the  
21 parties had not yet filed motions for summary judgment, even though the case had  
22 been pending for over a year and the Court had already touched on the substantive  
23 issues of patent invalidity); *Wonderland Nurserygoods Co. v. Baby Trend, Inc.*, No.  
24 EDCV 14-01153-VAP (SPx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53053, at \*6-7 (C.D. Cal.  
25 Apr. 20, 2015) (finding this factor weights in favor of granting a stay where fact  
26 discovery is not complete).

27 14. It does not make sense for the parties or the Court to expend resources  
28 litigating issues that would be mooted if the Board’s ruling is affirmed on appeal.

1 Some courts find this factor to weigh in favor of a stay even before the Board  
 2 institutes *inter partes* review, *see, e.g., Wonderland Nurserygoods Co. v. Baby*  
 3 *Trend, Inc.*, No. EDCV 14-01153-VAP (SPx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53053, at \*7-  
 4 8 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2015) (granting pre-institution stay), although there is far  
 5 from a consensus on that, *see, e.g., Pause Commers., Inc. v. Hulu, Inc.*, No. 2:21-  
 6 cv-02302-RGK-KES, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201641, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. June 24,  
 7 2021) (rejecting pre-institution stay). However, the IPRs have not only been  
 8 instituted but has reached a final written decision invalidating most of the claims of  
 9 the '653 Patent. At this point, simplification of the issues is likely. *See Cobalt*  
 10 *Boats, LLC v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc.*, No. 2:15cv21, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 225428,  
 11 at \*9 (E.D. Va. Mar. 20, 2017) ("When a party is appealing a decision to invalidate  
 12 claims, the Federal Circuit's decision is likely to simplify the case because it could  
 13 confirm the mootness of certain claims.").

14 15. Finally, there would be no undue prejudice to Gooloo or Pilot from  
 15 granting the stay, as confirmed by their joint request for this relief. While the stay  
 16 would, by its nature, delay the litigation, delay alone does not establish undue  
 17 prejudice. *Nichia*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 183610, at \*16.

18 16. For the good cause as explained in the paragraphs above, the Parties  
 19 stipulate and agree to stay this case until the Federal Circuit issues its mandate on  
 20 the NOCO IPR and the Shenzhen Chic IPR. Following issuance of a mandate on  
 21 both the NOCO IPR and the Shenzhen Chic IPR by the Federal Circuit (or a final  
 22 decision on one IPR that terminates any further proceedings on the other) the stay  
 23 shall be lifted immediately upon a motion to the Court by either party. The parties  
 24 agree to file a joint status report updating the Court within fourteen (14) days of the  
 25 final resolution of these actions.

26 17. The parties agree the stay is contingent upon Pilot (or any agent,  
 27 person, or entity acting on its behalf) in no way attempting to remove or interfere  
 28 with Gooloo's jump starter products by asserting any claim of the '653 Patent,

1 whether on Amazon, or any other marketplace, forum, store, or related selling  
 2 place. Should Pilot (or any agent, person, or entity acting on its behalf) attempt to  
 3 remove or remove any Gooloo products by asserting the '653 Patent in any forum,  
 4 the stay shall be lifted immediately upon a motion to the Court by either party.

5 18. The Parties further agree that the agreement to stay the case is  
 6 contingent on Pilot's representation to Gooloo that it will not use the stay or the  
 7 duration of the stay as a basis to challenge or evidence in support of any challenge  
 8 to Gooloo's jurisdiction over its claims in federal court, including, but not limited  
 9 to any challenge over the Court's subject matter jurisdiction.

10 19. The Parties further agree and stipulate that all current case deadlines  
 11 shall be suspended and all activity in the case shall cease.

12 20. The only exception to Paragraph 16 above is that the Parties agree that  
 13 Pilot may continue efforts to serve a third-party subpoena on Shenzhen Carku  
 14 Technology Co., Ltd. ("Carku") through Pilot's currently pending Unopposed  
 15 Motion For Issuance Of Letter Of Request To Examine Persons And Inspect  
 16 Documents Pursuant To Hague Convention (ECF No. 91), seeking service through  
 17 the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in  
 18 Civil or Commercial Matters ("Hague Service Convention"). But, any efforts to  
 19 enforce the third-party subpoena, once served, shall be stayed along with the rest of  
 20 the case.

21 21. Nothing in Paragraph 16 or anything else in this stipulation shall be  
 22 read or construed to limit or suspend either party's ability to seek immediate relief  
 23 from the Court under a temporary restraining order or related procedure.

24  
 25 Pursuant to the Local Rule 5-4.3.4, regarding signatures, I attest that  
 26 concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other  
 27 signatures listed below.  
 28

1 DATED: January 11, 2023

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

2 By: /s/ Heath L. Hyatt

3 John D. Esterhay, Bar No. 282330  
4 JEsterhay@perkinscoie.com  
5 John P. Schnurer, Bar No. 185725  
6 JSchnurer@perkinscoie.com  
7 PERKINS COIE LLP  
8 11452 El Camino Real, Suite 300  
9 San Diego, California 92130-2080  
10 Telephone: (858) 720-5700  
11 Facsimile: (858) 720-5799

12 Oliver M. Gold, Bar No. 279033  
13 OGold@perkinscoie.com  
14 1888 Century Park East  
15 Suite 1700  
16 Los Angeles, California 90067  
17 Telephone: (310) 788-3291  
18 Facsimile: (310) 788-3399

19 Heath L. Hyatt (Pro Hac Vice)  
20 HHyatt@perkinscoie.com  
21 1201 Third Avenue  
22 Suite 4900  
23 Seattle, Washington 98101

24 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
25 Shenzhen Gooloo E-Commerce Co.,  
26 Ltd.

27 DATED: January 11, 2023

**SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.**

28 By: /s/ Alex W. Ruge

Alex W. Ruge, (Pro Hac Vice)  
aruge@sheridanross.com  
Robert R. Brunelli (Pro Hac Vic)  
RBrunelli@sheridanross.com  
Aaron P. Bradford (Pro Hac Vice)  
ABradfordddford@sheridanross.com  
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 863-9700  
Facsimile: (303) 863-0223

Sean A. O'Brien, Bar No. 133154  
sao@paynefears.com  
PAYNE & FEARS LLP

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100  
Irvine, California 92614  
Telephone: (949) 851-1100  
Facsimile: (949) 851-1212

*Attorneys for Defendant*  
Pilot, Inc.

JOINT STIPULATION TO STAY

CASE

-9-

Case No. 22-cv-02219-RGK-E