

PATENT OWNER EXHIBIT 2001

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

CELLSPIN SOFT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BYTEDANCE LTD., BYTEDANCE PTE.
LTD., TIKTOK PTE. LTD.

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-496-JRG-RSP

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Compel and Opposed request for Expedited Briefing. (**Dkt. No. 40.**) Therein, Defendants contend "Cellspin has provide **no** substantive responses to Defendants' venue discovery requests, which have been pending for six weeks." (*Id.* at 1.) Cellspin's explanation for its failure is first that Defendants' discovery requests were seven days after the venue discovery order's seven day deadline and second that Defendants' motion to compel exceeds the Court's page limits. (Dkt. No. 45 1-4.)

In this case, the Court does not find that Defendants' procedural shortcomings warrant Cellspin's complete refusal to provide venue discovery.¹ Cellspin is **ORDERED** to materially respond to Defendants' discovery requests within two weeks and produce a 30(b)(6) deponent shortly thereafter.

SIGNED this 11th day of June, 2024.



ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Court finds Cellspin's complete refusal to provide discovery on procedural grounds particularly problematic where Defendants have apparently accommodated Cellspin by repeatedly offering additional deposition time beyond what was agreed upon.