United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CONCURRENT VENTURES, LLC, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES INC., et al., Defendants.	Case No. 25-cv-09567-JST **ORDER DENYING MOTION TO EXPEDITE** Re: ECF No. 191

Now before the Court is Defendants' administrative motion for an order shortening time. ECF No. 191. In the underlying motion, Defendants seek a declaration that they are not in violation of the *Sotera* stipulation filed in this case.[1] ECF No. 190; ECF No. 78. The apparent purpose of such a declaration is to persuade the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office not to de-institute the currently pending inter partes review proceeding. *See* ECF No. 190 at 19 ("A prompt ruling on this issue is necessary so the USPTO Director can have the guidance of this Court when deciding Plaintiffs' motions to terminate, and to allow the instituted IPR proceedings to move forward as the Sotera Stipulation remains in effect.").

Certainly, the Director of the USPTO may give this Court's decision regarding the *Sotera* stipulation whatever weight he thinks appropriate in making a de-institution decision. But there is no reason for this Court to rush its decision in an effort to decide that question before the Patent Trial and Appeals Board does. If the Director of the USPTO believes that this Court's decision will assist him in the exercise of his discretion, he will wait for that decision. If he does

[1] A *Sotera* stipulation is a stipulation that an IPR petitioner who is also a defendant in a patent case will not pursue in the district court proceeding the specific asserted grounds or any other ground that was raised or could have been reasonably raised in the IPR petition. *See Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 18–19 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020).

United States District Court
Northern District of California

not believe this Court's decision would be helpful, then rushing to issue it will make no difference.

The motion for an order shortening time is denied. All dates will remain the same: Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion regarding enforcement of the Sotera stipulation is due on April 3, 2026. Any reply is due on April 10, 2026, and the hearing remains scheduled for May 28, 2026.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 25, 2026

JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge