

Christina N. Goodrich (SBN 261722)
christina.goodrich@klgates.com
Rachel Berman (SBN 352237)
rachel.berman@klgates.com
K&L GATES LLP
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard
Eighth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: +1 310 552 5000
Facsimile: +1 310 552 5001

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
Entropic Communications, LLC*

(Additional counsel listed in signature block)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC., *et
al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01049-JWH-KES
(Lead Case)

Case No. 2:23-cv-01050-JWH-KES
(Related Case)

JOINT REPORT

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC., *et
al.*,

Counter-Claimants,

v.

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS,
LLC, MAXLINEAR INC., AND
MAXLINEAR COMMUNICATIONS
LLC,

Counter-Defendants.

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS,
LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMCAST CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

JOINT REPORT

Pursuant to the Court’s February 26, 2025, Order (ECF No. 369), Plaintiff Entropic Communications, LLC (“Entropic”) and Defendants Comcast Corporation; Comcast Cable Communications, LLC; Comcast Cable Communications Management, LLC (collectively, “Comcast”); Cox Communications, Inc.; Coxcom, LLC; Cox Communications California LLC (collectively, “Cox”), and Counter-Defendants MaxLinear, Inc. and MaxLinear Communications LLC (collectively, “MaxLinear”) met and conferred on March 6, 2025, regarding the parties’ respective positions on a severance or stay in case numbers 2:23-cv-01049-JWH-KES and 2:23-cv-01049-JWH-KES. The Parties hereby submit the following Joint Report:

Entropic’s Position:

Entropic would be amenable to the deconsolidation of the -1049 and -1050 cases as follows:

Cox (-1049) – Entropic proposes that the -1049 action proceed in full. Cox has indicated that it intends to seek a stay of at least part of the -1049 action. Entropic does not agree to such a stay or to Cox’s description of the cases or issues below; if Cox intends to seek such relief from the Court, it should file a motion and the parties can brief the issues at that time.

With respect to the pleadings, Entropic filed a Motion to Amend its Complaint against Cox. (ECF No. 114.) The Special Master issued a Report and Recommendation on March 6, 2024, recommending that Entropic’s Motion to Amend be granted. (ECF No. 277.) Cox did not file objections to the Special Master’s March 6 R&R. Upon adoption of that R&R by the Court, Entropic will file its Amended Complaint.

Comcast (-1050) – Entropic states there is not currently a stay in place. The Court ordered a stay conditioned on Cox’s agreement to be bound, but Cox did not agree. (Dkt. 366 at 11.) Entropic submits that the -1050 matter should proceed towards resolution of the outstanding issues at the pleading stage. Entropic is amenable to a stay of discovery as to Comcast, pending the Final Written Decisions

1 in the IPRs, in order to prioritize resolution of those issues, which include
2 jurisdictional challenges.

3 With respect to the pleadings, Comcast has previously moved to dismiss
4 Entropic's pleadings on the grounds that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.
5 (ECF Nos. 175 & 180 (sealed).) Because subject matter jurisdiction is a threshold
6 issue, Entropic submits that the resolution of that jurisdictional question should not
7 be delayed by any stay pending IPR. Further, because not all asserted patents are
8 subject to IPR, the Court will need to resolve the jurisdictional question regardless
9 of the outcome of the IPRs. This fact also distinguishes Comcast's cited cases, which
10 involved stays pending proceedings that could fully resolve the matters before the
11 court. And Entropic submits that it is inappropriate for Comcast to seek relief from
12 the Court that is tied to the merits, such as a stay based on simplification of the
13 merits, while delaying resolution of an attack on the Court's jurisdiction to resolve
14 the merits in the first instance.

15 Comcast has indicated that it intends to move again to dismiss Entropic's
16 pleadings. While it couches this as a challenge to the sufficiency of Entropic's
17 willfulness allegations, Comcast apparently intends to argue that if the willfulness
18 allegations are insufficient that Entropic's pleadings would need to be dismissed for
19 lack of subject matter jurisdiction. A delay in resolution of these threshold issues
20 would be highly prejudicial to Entropic and its ability to seek appellate review in a
21 timely fashion, if needed. By contrast, Comcast faces no prejudice from Entropic's
22 proposal because Entropic proposes that discovery remain stayed as to Comcast.

23 Procedurally, Entropic has filed motions to amend its pleadings. (ECF Nos.
24 131, 143.) Comcast has filed a Notice of Non-Opposition to Entropic's motions.
25 (ECF No. 248.) The Special Master's March 6, 2024 R&R recommended granting
26 Entropic's motions. (ECF No. 277.) Upon adoption of that R&R by the Court, or
27 else by stipulation of the parties, Entropic will file a Third Amended Complaint. At
28

1 that time, Comcast can file its Rule 12 motion, and the parties can focus their
2 resources on resolving the pleadings issues.

3 Entropic further states that the Court need not delay issuance of its pending
4 *Markman* ruling in either action, as it is applicable to both.

5 **Comcast’s Position:**

6 Entropic’s case against Comcast, (-1050), should remain stayed for all the
7 reasons stated in Comcast’s motion to stay (Dkt. Nos. 345, 351) and found in the
8 Court’s Order. Dkt. No. 366 (the “Order”). Seven of the eight asserted patents are
9 subject to *inter partes* review and all of the asserted patents relate to the same
10 technology and will involve overlapping discovery and witnesses. Thus, keeping the
11 Comcast case stayed in full avoids the need for unnecessary and recursive discovery
12 arising from piecemeal litigation. Order at 7 (proceeding piecemeal “complicat[es]
13 the proceedings” and “many facts weigh against” doing so).

14 Entropic’s suggestion that it be permitted to amend its pleadings and the parties
15 then brief Comcast’s motion to dismiss is both unnecessary and wasteful. The Court
16 already held that it has subject matter jurisdiction over claims of willful patent
17 infringement. *Entropic Commc’ns, LLC v. Comcast Corp.*, 702 F. Supp. 3d 954, 963
18 (C.D. Cal. 2023). Thus, Comcast’s motion to dismiss any further amended complaint
19 would challenge the adequacy of Entropic’s willfulness allegations under Rule
20 12(b)(6) and courts routinely stay cases prior to deciding Rule 12(b)(6) motions. *See*,
21 *e.g.*, *Spertus v. Ins. Co. of the State of Penn.*, 2015 WL 13357666, at *2 (C.D. Cal.
22 Aug. 6, 2015) (staying the case and declining to rule on motion to dismiss because it
23 would be “inefficient”); *Cooper v. Blum Collins, LLP*, 2024 WL 4403878, at *2
24 (C.D. Cal. June 5, 2024) (staying case “on its own motion” and declining to rule on
25 pending motion to dismiss). Entropic’s suggestion that it would be prejudiced from
26 waiting on appellate review is “not a persuasive reason” to lift the stay because it is
27 merely part of “[t]he general prejudice of having to wait for a resolution.” Order at
28 8-9 (holding that any prejudice to Entropic from a full stay would be minimal).

1 Indeed, maintaining the stay will be particularly efficient here given that Comcast's
2 covenant not to sue expires in August, before the likely Final Written Decision dates
3 in the *inter partes* reviews.

4 Finally, Comcast takes no position as to how, if at all, Entropic's case against
5 Cox, Case No. 23-cv-01049, should proceed. However, regardless of whether any
6 part of the Cox case goes forward, Comcast's case should remain stayed in its
7 entirety. *See, e.g., PowerLED Techs., LLC v. TCL Corp.*, 2020 WL 11710631, at *2
8 (C.D. Cal. July 24, 2020) (granting motion to stay as to one defendant while
9 proceeding with other cases against different defendants).¹ However, Comcast and
10 Cox are differently situated both in terms of the procedural posture of their cases
11 generally and with regards to MaxLinear specifically such that Comcast will be
12 required to conduct its own discovery of MaxLinear separate from Cox. Having sold
13 the asserted patents to Entropic for assertion in litigation against multiple parties in
14 which MaxLinear maintains a financial interest, MaxLinear cannot be heard to
15 complain about the potential for multiple depositions.

16 **Cox's Position:**

17 Cox believes the Court should deconsolidate the Cox case (-1049) and
18 Comcast case (-1050), stay all aspects of the case against Cox that overlap with
19 litigation Entropic brought against Cox's vendor, Vantiva S.A. (the "Vantiva Case"),
20 and sever Entropic's claims asserting U.S. Patent Nos. 10,135,682 and 9,866,438²,
21 which are not asserted in the Vantiva Case.

22 After Comcast's Motion to Stay (Dkt. 345) was filed, Entropic filed a
23 duplicative suit against Vantiva SA in the Eastern District of Texas for infringement
24 of U.S. Patent Nos. 8,223,775; 8,792,008; 9,825,826; 11,318,866; 11,399,206; and

25 ¹ The Court consolidated the Cox and Comcast cases only "through the date of the *Markman*
26 hearing," Dkt. No. 95 at 2, such that the two cases are not presently consolidated in any event.

27 ² U.S. Patent No. 9,866,438 was not asserted in Entropic's original complaint against Cox.
28 However, Entropic later filed a Motion to Amend (Dkt. 114), seeking to add U.S. Patent No.
9,866,438 to the Cox case, and Special Master Keyzer recommended Entropic's Motion be
granted. Special Master Keyzer's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 277) has not been ruled on
by the Court.

1 11,785,275 in the case entitled *Entropic Communications, LLC v. Vantiva SA*, Case
2 No. 2-24-cv-00912 (the “Vantiva Case”). Thereafter, on February 10, 2025, Entropic
3 served Vantiva. Each of the patents asserted the Vantiva Case have also been asserted
4 by Entropic against Cox³ in the instant litigation and Entropic accuses of
5 infringement Vantiva’s customer premises equipment, including cable modems and
6 set top boxes. All of the cable modems, and nearly all of the set top boxes, accused
7 of infringement in the Vantiva Case are also accused of infringement in the instant
8 case. Vantiva, in fact, supplies Cox with cable modems and set top boxes that are
9 accused of infringement in this case, as well as the Vantiva Case.

10 The case against Cox involving the patents asserted against Vantiva should
11 thus be stayed pending resolution of the Vantiva Case under the customer suit
12 exception. The customer-suit exception “stay[s] earlier-filed litigation against a
13 customer while a later-filed case involving the manufacturer proceeds in another
14 forum.” *Spread Spectrum Screening LLC v. Eastman Kodak Co.*, 657 F.3d 1349,
15 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2011). The doctrine aims to relieve “the burdens of trial on the
16 customer, for it is the manufacturer who is generally the ‘true defendant’ in the
17 dispute,” *In re Nintendo of Am., Inc.*, 756 F.3d 1363, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2014), and
18 implement the “strong preference” for avoiding simultaneous litigation by two
19 district courts on the same issues of liability (infringement and invalidity), *In re*
20 *Google Inc.*, 588 F. App’x 988, 990 (Fed. Cir. 2014). Those policies apply squarely
21 to this case because resolution of the Vantiva Case will be dispositive. *See, e.g., Wok*
22 *& Pan, Ind., Inc. v. Staples, Inc.*, 2015 WL 13949651 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2015)
23 (“Because this customer-suit rule operates as an exception to the first-to-file rule, the
24 manufacturer’s suit will take priority over the customer suit even though the customer
25 suit was filed first.”); *Xiaohua Huang v. Open-Silicon, Inc.*, 2018 WL 5099275, at

26 _____
27 ³ U.S. Patent No. 11,785,275 was not asserted in Entropic’s original complaint against Cox.
28 However, Entropic later filed a Motion to Amend (Dkt. 114), seeking to add U.S. Patent No.
11,785,275 to the Cox case, and Special Master Keyzer recommended Entropic’s Motion be
granted. Special Master Keyzer’s Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 277) has not been ruled on
by the Court.

1 *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2018) (A stay with respect to Open-Silicon is appropriate
2 under the customer-suit doctrine to spare it the burdens of trial while eSilicon litigates
3 Mr. Huang's infringement claims with respect to its technology.”); *Katz v. Lear*
4 *Siegler, Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1459, 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (similar).

5 Finally, because U.S. Patent Nos. 10,135,682 and 9,866,438 are not asserted
6 in the Vantiva case and consistent with Entropic’s prior proposal (Dkt. 349), Cox
7 suggests the Court sever those patents and proceed with resolving the parties’ dispute
8 concerning those patents. Should the Court desire, Cox is happy to fully brief this
9 issue.

10 **MaxLinear’s Position:**

11 MaxLinear is subject only to counterclaims brought by Cox, and the Special
12 Master’s recommendation that those counterclaims be dismissed with prejudice is
13 ready for the Court’s review if that case moves forward. (*See* ECF No. 302 at 74.)
14 Accordingly, MaxLinear takes no position on the timing with which claims proceed
15 in this case. MaxLinear wishes to note, however, the potential for deconsolidation
16 of the cases to result in discovery inefficiencies. In particular, MaxLinear expects
17 that defendants may seek the depositions of current or former MaxLinear employees
18 on issues relating to the patent claims, and placing these cases on different schedules
19 risks subjecting individuals to duplicative depositions. Accordingly, should the
20 Court separate the -1049 and -1050 case schedules, MaxLinear respectfully requests
21 that the Court also order the parties to confer on deposition scheduling and use
22 reasonable, good faith efforts to avoid subjecting the same individual to more than
23 one deposition.

24
25
26 Dated: March 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

27 By: /s/ Rachel Berman
28 Christina N. Goodrich (SBN 261722)

1 christina.goodrich@klgates.com
2 Rachel Berman (SBN 352237)
3 rachel.berman@klgates.com
4 **K&L GATES LLP**
5 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard
6 Eighth Floor
7 Los Angeles, CA 90067
8 Telephone: (310) 552- 5000
9 Facsimile: (310) 552- 5001

7 Michael T. Pieja (SBN 250351)
8 mpieja@goldmanismail.com
9 Alan E. Littmann (*pro hac vice*)
10 alittmann@goldmanismail.com
11 Douglas Jordan Winnard (SBN 275420)
12 dwinnard@goldmanismail.com
13 Xaviere N. Giroud (*pro hac vice*)
14 xgiroud@goldmanismail.com
15 Kurt A. Holtzman (*pro hac vice*)
16 kholtzman@goldmanismail.com
17 **GOLDMAN ISMAIL TOMASELLI**
18 **BRENNAN & BAUM LLP**
19 200 South Wacker Dr., 22nd Floor
20 Chicago, IL 60606
21 Tel: (312) 681-6000
22 Fax: (312) 881-5191

17 Vincent J. Galluzzo (*pro hac vice*)
18 **K&L Gates LLP**
19 300 South Tryon Street
20 Suite 1000
21 Charlotte, NC 28202
22 Telephone: (704) 331-7400
23 vincent.galluzzo@klgates.com

21 James A. Shimota (*pro hac vice*)
22 jim.shimota@klgates.com
23 Jason A. Engel (*pro hac vice*)
24 jason.engel@klgates.com
25 **K&L GATES LLP**
26 70 W. Madison Street, Suite 3300
27 Chicago, IL 60602
28 Telephone: (312) 372-1121
Facsimile: (312) 827-8000

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Entropic Communications, LLC

1
2 Dated: March 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

3 By: /s/ David J. Lisson

4 Ashok Ramani (SBN 200020)

5 ashok.ramani@davispolk.com

6 David J. Lisson (SBN 250994)

7 david.lisson@davispolk.com

8 Micah G. Block (SBN 270712)

9 micah.block@davispolk.com

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL LLP

10 900 Middlefield Road, Suite 200

11 Redwood City, CA 94063

12 Tel: (650) 752-2000

13 Krishnan Padmanabhan (SBN 254220)

14 kpadmanabhan@winston.com

15 200 Park Avenue

16 New York, NY 10166

17 Tel: (212) 294-6700

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

18 200 Park Avenue

19 New York, NY 10166

20 Tel: (212) 294-6700

21 Saranya Raghavan

22 sraghavan@winston.com

23 Natalie R. Holden

24 nholden@winston.com

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

25 35 West Wacker Drive

26 Chicago, IL 60601

27 Tel: (312) 558-5600

28 Brian E. Ferguson

bferguson@winston.com

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

1901 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20036

Tel: (202) 282-5000

Claire Dial

cdial@winston.com

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

800 Capitol Street, Suite 2400

Houston, TX 77002

1 Tel: (713) 651-2600

2 Diana Hughes Leiden
3 dhleiden@winston.com

4 **WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**
5 333 South Grand Avenue
6 Los Angeles, CA 90071
7 Tel: (213) 615-1924

8 Louis Campbell (SBN 221282)
9 llcampbell@winston.com
10 **WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**
11 255 Shoreline Dr, Suite 520
12 Redwood City, CA 94065
13 Tel: (650) 858-6500

14 *Attorneys for Comcast Corporation, et al.*

15 Dated: March 7, 2025

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 By: /s/ April E. Isaacson
18 April E. Isaacson (SBN 180638)
19 aisaacson@kilpatricktownsend.com
20 **KILPATRICK TOWNSEND &**
21 **STOCKTON LLP**
22 Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1900
23 San Francisco CA 94111
24 (415) 273 8306

25 Sarah Y. Kamran (SBN 347617)
26 skamran@kilpatricktownsend.com
27 **KILPATRICK TOWNSEND &**
28 **STOCKTON LLP**
1801 Century Park East, Suite 2300
Los Angeles CA 90067
(310) 777 3733

Mitchell G. Stockwell (*pro hac vice*)
mstockwell@kilpatricktownsend.com
Vaibhav P. Kadaba (*pro hac vice*)
wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com
Michael J. Turton (*pro hac vice*)
mturton@kilpatricktownsend.com
Courtney S. Dabbieri (*pro hac vice*)
cdabbieri@kilpatricktownsend.com
Christopher S. Leah (*pro hac vice*)

1 cleah@kilpatricktownsend.com
2 Andrew N. Saul (*pro hac vice*)
3 asaul@kilpatricktownsend.com
4 **KILPATRICK TOWNSEND &**
5 **STOCKTON LLP**
6 1100 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 2800
7 Atlanta GA 30309
8 (404) 815 6500

Attorneys for Defendants
Cox Communications, Inc., et al.

9 Dated: March 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

10 By: /s/ John Lanham
11 Bitra Rahebi (CA SBN 209351)
12 brahebi@mofo.com
13 Alex S. Yap (CA SBN 241400)
14 ayap@mofo.com
15 Rose S. Lee (CA SBN 294658)
16 roselee@mofo.com
17 **MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP**
18 707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000
19 Los Angeles, California 90017-3543
20 Telephone: (213) 892-5200
21 Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

22 Richard S.J. Hung (CA SBN 197425)
23 rhung@mofo.com
24 **MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP**
25 425 Market Street,
26 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
27 Palo Alto, California 94304-1018
28 Telephone: (415) 268-7000
Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

John Lanham (CA SBN 289382)
jlanham@mofo.com
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
Telephone: (858) 720-5100
Facsimile: (858) 720-5125

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

*Attorneys for Counter-Defendants
MaxLinear, Inc., et al.*

SIGNATURE CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to L.R. 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i), I, Rachel Berman, attest that all other signatories listed herein and on whose behalf the filing is submitted concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.

Dated: March 7, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Rachel Berman
Rachel Berman (SBN 352237)
rachel.berman@klgates.com
K&L GATES LLP
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard
Eighth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 552- 5000
Facsimile: (310) 552- 5001