

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.	SACV 23-2415-GW-JDEx	Date	March 14, 2025
Title	<u>X1 Discovery, Inc. v. Microsoft Corporation</u>		

Present: The Honorable	GEORGE H. WU, United States District Judge
------------------------	--

Javier Gonzalez	Not Reported
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):	Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):
None Present	None Present

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS – COURT ORDER

There is currently a status conference set for March 17, 2025 in this matter. The Court has received and read the parties' Joint Status Report (ECF No. 57) wherein it is noted that: (1) the Court stayed the above-captioned action in its entirety until a final determination by the U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC") in *In the Matter of Certain Computing Devices Utilizing Indexed Search Systems and Components Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1389 ("the ITC Proceeding"); (2) on February 26, 2025, administrative Law Judge Elliot entered a Final Initial Determination in the ITC Proceeding, finding no violation of Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, 19 U.S.C. § 1337; (3) X1 declined to petition for Commission review and certifies that it will not appeal the determination once it becomes final; (4) Microsoft filed petitions for inter partes review for three of the patents asserted in this litigation (U.S. Patent Nos. 10,552,490; 7,370,035; and 9,633,139), the institution decisions for the Microsoft IPRs are expected to issue no later than July 27, 2025; and (5) Plaintiff is requesting that the current stay be lifted while Defendant opposes lifting it.

The Court finds that it can issue the following order without hearing further statements from the parties. Thus, the March 17, 2025 status conference is taken off-calendar as per C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15.

The Court will lift the stay upon final determination of the ITC proceeding, not now. This is what the parties were previously told in Docket No. 53. Additionally, herein, there are only three asserted patents. The Court would deny the request for a continuation of the stay, without prejudice. If necessary, Defendant can file a motion to stay if the PTAB institutes review.