

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

PROCOMM INTERNATIONAL PTE.
LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A
VERIZON WIRELESS,
TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM
ERICSSON, and ERICSSON INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:24-cv-00009-RWS-RSP

ORDER


Before the Court is Defendants' Opposed Motion to Stay Pending *Inter Partes* Review. **Dkt. No. 51.** Plaintiff opposes. Dkt. No. 56. After consideration, the motion is **DENIED** as premature.

The "universal practice" in this District, as well as the practice of most district courts, is to deny a motion for stay when the Patent Trial and Appeal Board has not yet acted on a petition for *inter partes* review. *Trover*, 2015 WL 1069179, at *6 (collecting cases); *see also Peloton Interactive*, 2019 WL 3826051, at *2 (citation omitted). The reasoning behind this is that unless the Board indicates there is a serious chance it will invalidate all the asserted claims, the Court will not needlessly wait to rule on the remaining asserted claims.

Here, the Board has not instituted *inter partes* review on any of the asserted patents in this case. *See* Dkt. No. 56 at 1.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Defendants' Motion as premature.

SIGNED this 6th day of April, 2025.


ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE