

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

SINOTECHNIX LLC

v.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,  
INC., ET AL.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:24-CV-0544-JRG-RSP

---

**Motions Hearing  
MAG. JUDGE ROY PAYNE PRESIDING  
April 15, 2025**

**OPEN: 1:09 pm**

**ADJOURN: 3:07 pm**

---

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF:

Bill Kennedy  
Patrick Conroy

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS:

Travis Underwood  
Paul Bondor  
Jennifer Przybylski

LAW CLERK:

Greg Saltz

COURT REPORTER:

Karen Tyler

COURTROOM DEPUTY:

Wendy Asbel

Court opened. Case called. Bill Kennedy introduced co-counsel and announced ready. Travis Underwood introduced co-counsel and announced ready.

Paul Bondor argued Defendants' Motion to Strike Certain Products From Plaintiff's Infringement Contentions for Failure to Comply with P.R. 3-1 (Dkt. No. 65). Mr. Bondor asked for the courtroom to be sealed. The courtroom remained unsealed but the Court agreed to have the slides sealed. Bill Kennedy responded and presented the Court with examples of the "bubble shaped" and "candle shaped" LEDs. The Court ruled that only products that can be identified in the manner contemplated by Local Patent Rule 3-1 should be listed in the infringement contentions, but that other "reasonably similar" products are a proper subject for timely discovery.

During the break, counsel conferred, and Mr. Kennedy thereafter informed the Court that the parties had reached an agreement regarding both the Motion to Strike (Dkt. No. 65) and Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. to Produce Complete Interrogatory Responses and Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 70). The parties described the agreement and were directed to reduce it to writing. Mr. Underwood concurred.

Mr. Kennedy stated that, in view of the foregoing, he believes the parties can work out Defendants' Motion for Protective Order Pursuant to FRCP 26(c)(1) Precluding Discovery, Including Depositions, Concerning Products Not Properly Accused (Dkt. No. 82). The Court directed Defendant to file a motion to withdraw the Motion.