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

MAXEON SOLAR PTE. LTD.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:24-CV-00210-JRG
CANADIAN SOLAR, INC.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Maxeon Solar PTE. Ltd.'s ("Plaintiff") Partial Motion to Dismiss Inequitable Conduct Counterclaim and Opposed Motion to Strike Inequitable Conduct Defense (the "Motion"). (Dkt. No. 23.) In the Motion, Plaintiff moves to dismiss Defendant Canadian Solar, Inc.'s ("Defendant") counterclaim Count IV and to strike Defendant's Seventh Defense. (*Id*. at 1.) Since Plaintiff filed the Motion, Defendant filed Canadian Solar Inc.'s First Amended Answer, Defenses, and Counterclaims for Declaratory Judgment. (Dkt. No. 25.)

It is well established that a later-filed amended pleading moots a motion asking the Court to dismiss or strike an earlier-filed pleading. *See Griffin v. Am. Zurich Ins. Co.*, 697 F. App'x 793, 797 (5th Cir. 2017) ("Once filed, that amended complaint rendered all earlier motions . . . moot."); *see also Bishop Display Tech LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, No. 2:21-cv-00139-JRG, Dkt. No. 40 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 4, 2021) ("Once Plaintiff filed its amended complaint, the Motion became moot."); *Ultravision Technologies, LLC v. Eaton Corp. PLC*, 2019 WL 11250161, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 7, 2019) ("Accordingly, the filing of an amended complaint moots a motion to dismiss the original complaint.").

Maxeon EX2007
CSI v. Maxeon
IPR2024-01038

Accordingly, the Court finds that the Motion (Dkt. No. 23) should be and hereby is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of July, 2024.

RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE