

Postures of Motion: Stipulated/Agreed Types of Document: Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review Judges: Rodney Gilstrap

Type of Document	Result of Motion	Case	Date ▲	PDF Sc...
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC et al v. Research Now, Inc. 2-13-cv-00962 (EDTX)	Jun. 10, 2014	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Personal Audio, LLC v. CBS Corporation 2-13-cv-00270 (EDTX)	Apr. 30, 2015	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 6-15-cv-00690 (EDTX)	Apr. 05, 2016	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Camfil USA, Inc. v. Imperial Systems, Inc. et al 2-15-cv-01755 (EDTX)	Jun. 22, 2016	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Apple Inc. 2-15-cv-00621 (EDTX)	Oct. 25, 2016	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VoltStar Technologies, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC et al 2-16-cv-01181 (EDTX)	Jan. 26, 2017	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Kemper Corporation et al 6-16-cv-00081 (EDTX)	Feb. 16, 2017	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Motorola Mobility LLC 2-16-cv-00992 (EDTX)	Jun. 30, 2017	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Google LLC 2-16-cv-00566 (EDTX)	Jul. 26, 2017	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. RingCentral, Inc. 2-17-cv-00354 (EDTX)	Feb. 09, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Apple Inc. 2-17-cv-00708 (EDTX)	Jun. 06, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VoltStar Technologies, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC et al 2-16-cv-01181 (EDTX)	Jul. 03, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al 2-17-cv-00650 (EDTX)	Jul. 03, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Amazon.com, Inc. 2-18-cv-00123 (EDTX)	Aug. 07, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al 2-17-cv-00650 (EDTX)	Aug. 24, 2018	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Motorola Mobility LLC 2-16-cv-00992 (EDTX)	May. 02, 2019	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Avaya Inc. 6-15-cv-01168 (EDTX)	May. 07, 2019	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC 2-18-cv-00549 (EDTX)	Jul. 11, 2019	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-19-cv-00102 (EDTX)	Dec. 04, 2019	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Verizon Communications Inc. et al 2-18-cv-00513 (EDTX)	Jan. 01, 2020	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-18-cv-00514 (EDTX)	Jan. 03, 2020	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	NCR Corporation v. Lighthouse Consulting Group, LLC 2-19-cv-00392 (EDTX)	Apr. 27, 2020	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	Lighthouse Consulting Group, LLC v. Independent Financial 2-19-cv-00373 (EDTX)	May. 05, 2020	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-19-cv-00102 (EDTX)	Jun. 22, 2020	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VARTA Microbattery GmbH v. Costco Wholesale Corporation 2-20-cv-00051 (EDTX)	Jan. 12, 2021	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Nanoco Technologies, Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-20-cv-00038 (EDTX)	Jul. 01, 2021	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co. et al 2-21-cv-00305 (EDTX)	Nov. 17, 2021	

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Broadcom Incorporated 2-21-cv-00247 (EDTX)	Nov. 22, 2021
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Broadcom Incorporated 2-21-cv-00247 (EDTX)	Dec. 02, 2021
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. AT&T Corp. et al 2-21-cv-00241 (EDTX)	May. 12, 2022
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	BoxCast Inc. v. Resi Media LLC 2-21-cv-00217 (EDTX)	May. 25, 2022
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Arigna Technology Limited v. Porsche AG et al 2-21-cv-00173 (EDTX)	Feb. 28, 2023
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	NorthStar Systems LLC v. Volkswagen AG 2-22-cv-00486 (EDTX)	Mar. 08, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Fendgo LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00221 (EDTX)	Jun. 14, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Greenthread, LLC v. OmniVision Technologies, Inc. 2-23-cv-00212 (EDTX)	Aug. 30, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Athalonz LLC v. Under Armour, Inc. 2-23-cv-00193 (EDTX)	Sep. 13, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Foras Technologies Limited v. Volkswagen AG et al 2-23-cv-00314 (EDTX)	Nov. 08, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Flip Phone Games Inc. v. PLR Worldwide Sales Limited 2-23-cv-00139 (EDTX)	Dec. 10, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied in part granted in part	Molecular Rebar Design, LLC et al v. LG Energy Solution, Ltd. 2-24-cv-00107 (EDTX)	Jan. 10, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Molecular Rebar Design, LLC et al v. LG Energy Solution, Ltd. 2-24-cv-00107 (EDTX)	Feb. 06, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Greenthread, LLC v. OmniVision Technologies, Inc. 2 23 cv 00212 (EDTX)	Mar. 26, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd. v. Hanwha Energy Corporation et al 2-24-cv-00262 (EDTX)	May. 01, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd. v. Hanwha Energy Corporation et al 2-24-cv-00262 (EDTX)	May. 05, 2025

Postures of Motion: Stipulated/Agreed Types of Document: Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review Judges: Rodney Gilstrap

	Type of Document	Result of Motion	Case	Date ▲
—	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	MPHJ Technology Investments, LLC et al v. Research Now, Inc. 2-13-cv-00962 (EDTX)	Jun. 10, 2014
	Stay of Proceedings L Factors Considered L Simplification of Issues	The court denied without prejudice defendant's unopposed motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review. "Third parties . . . have filed a petition for <i>inter partes</i> review of the [patents-in-suit]. . . . [T]he PTAB proceeding is at an even earlier stage than this litigation – it will take the PTAB up to three months from now to determine whether or not to institute the <i>inter partes</i> review at all. Whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the case is wholly unpredictable, if not completely speculative, at this time. . . . Even assuming the PTAB does institute the <i>inter partes</i> review, that [defendant] is not a party to the PTAB proceeding casts doubt on the extent, if any, a stay will simplify the issues in this case by way of the estoppel effect of the administrative proceeding."		
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Personal Audio, LLC v. CBS Corporation 2-13-cv-00270 (EDTX)	Apr. 30, 2015
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 6-15-cv-00690 (EDTX)	Apr. 05, 2016
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Camfil USA, Inc. v. Imperial Systems, Inc. et al 2-15-cv-01755 (EDTX)	Jun. 22, 2016
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture LLC v. Apple Inc. 2-15-cv-00621 (EDTX)	Oct. 25, 2016
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VoltStar Technologies, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC et al 2-16-cv-01181 (EDTX)	Jan. 26, 2017
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Kemper Corporation et al 6-16-cv-00081 (EDTX)	Feb. 16, 2017
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Motorola Mobility LLC 2-16-cv-00992 (EDTX)	Jun. 30, 2017
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Google LLC 2-16-cv-00566 (EDTX)	Jul. 26, 2017
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. RingCentral, Inc. 2-17-cv-00354 (EDTX)	Feb. 09, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Apple Inc. 2-17-cv-00708 (EDTX)	Jun. 06, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VoltStar Technologies, Inc. v. AT&T Mobility LLC et al 2-16-cv-01181 (EDTX)	Jul. 03, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al 2-17-cv-00650 (EDTX)	Jul. 03, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Amazon.com, Inc. 2-18-cv-00123 (EDTX)	Aug. 07, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. et al 2-17-cv-00650 (EDTX)	Aug. 24, 2018
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Motorola Mobility LLC 2-16-cv-00992 (EDTX)	May. 02, 2019
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc USA, Inc. et al v. Avaya Inc. 6-15-cv-01168 (EDTX)	May. 07, 2019
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Google LLC 2-18-cv-00549 (EDTX)	Jul. 11, 2019
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-19-cv-00102 (EDTX)	Dec. 04, 2019
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. Verizon Communications Inc. et al 2-18-cv-00513 (EDTX)	Jan. 01, 2020
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-18-cv-00514 (EDTX)	Jan. 03, 2020
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	NCR Corporation v. Lighthouse Consulting Group, LLC 2-19-cv-00392 (EDTX)	Apr. 27, 2020
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	Lighthouse Consulting Group, LLC v. Independent Financial 2-19-cv-00373 (EDTX)	May. 05, 2020

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Uniloc 2017 LLC v. AT&T Services, Inc. et al 2-19-cv-00102 (EDTX)	Jun. 22, 2020
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	VARTA Microbattery GmbH v. Costco Wholesale Corporation 2-20-cv-00051 (EDTX)	Jan. 12, 2021
— Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Nanoco Technologies, Ltd. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-20-cv-00038 (EDTX)	Jul. 01, 2021
Stay of Proceedings L Factors Considered L Simplification of Issues Stay of Proceedings L Factors Considered L Stage of Litigation		The court granted the parties' joint motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review. "The Court, having considered the relevant factors, is hesitant to stay this case. Discovery is complete. . . . A firm trial date is set. Although a stay could simplify issues for trial in the abstract and on paper, it does so at the expense of delaying the speedy and efficient adjudication of the other issues in controversy. [Defendant] filed its IPR petitions roughly nine months after [plaintiff] filed its complaint. Given the fairly predictable timelines in this Court and the statutory timelines at the PTAB, [defendant] could have anticipated that institution decisions would occur in the shadow of pre-trial briefing, with the potential date for final written decisions from the PTAB far exceeding the scheduled trial date in this Court. . . . In fact, it is increasingly common for the PTAB to decline to institute <i>inter partes</i> review in view of parallel district court proceedings if the district court will reach trial on the merits more efficiently and expeditiously. . . . But for the parties' agreement on the Motion, the Court would likely have denied this Motion."	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co. et al 2-21-cv-00305 (EDTX)	Nov. 17, 2021
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Broadcom Incorporated 2-21-cv-00247 (EDTX)	Nov. 22, 2021
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. Broadcom Incorporated 2-21-cv-00247 (EDTX)	Dec. 02, 2021
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	K.Mizra LLC v. AT&T Corp. et al 2-21-cv-00241 (EDTX)	May. 12, 2022
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	BoxCast Inc. v. Resi Media LLC 2-21-cv-00217 (EDTX)	May. 25, 2022
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Arigna Technology Limited v. Porsche AG et al 2-21-cv-00173 (EDTX)	Feb. 28, 2023
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	NorthStar Systems LLC v. Volkswagen AG 2-22-cv-00486 (EDTX)	Mar. 08, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Fendgo LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00221 (EDTX)	Jun. 14, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Greenthread, LLC v. OmniVision Technologies, Inc. 2-23-cv-00212 (EDTX)	Aug. 30, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Athalonz LLC v. Under Armour, Inc. 2-23-cv-00193 (EDTX)	Sep. 13, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Foras Technologies Limited v. Volkswagen AG et al 2-23-cv-00314 (EDTX)	Nov. 08, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Flip Phone Games Inc. v. PLR Worldwide Sales Limited 2-23-cv-00139 (EDTX)	Dec. 10, 2024
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied in part granted in part	Molecular Rebar Design, LLC et al v. LG Energy Solution, Ltd. 2-24-cv-00107 (EDTX)	Jan. 10, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Molecular Rebar Design, LLC et al v. LG Energy Solution, Ltd. 2-24-cv-00107 (EDTX)	Feb. 06, 2025
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Greenthread, LLC v. OmniVision Technologies, Inc. 2-23-cv-00212 (EDTX)	Mar. 26, 2025
— Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	Maxon Solar Pte. Ltd. v. Hanwha Energy Corporation et al 2-24-cv-00262 (EDTX)	May. 01, 2025
District Court Procedural Issues L Stay of Proceedings Infringement Defenses L PTAB Post-Decision Estoppel L PTAB Petitioner Estoppel Following IPR (35 USC § 315(e))		The court denied defendant's unopposed motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review without prejudice to resubmission if both defendants agree to be bound by IPR estoppel. "The Court notes that by filing the IPR petitions, [Defendant 1] has agreed to be bound by the full statutory estoppel provision of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e) based on any ground actually raised or that reasonably could have been raised as part of its IPR proceeding. . . . [Defendant 2] has not joined in the IPRs, nor has it expressly agreed to be bound by the full statutory estoppel provision of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e). [Defendant 2's] failure to submit itself to the full statutory estoppel leaves [Defendant 2] the ability to advance altogether new invalidity theories after the conclusion of [Defendant 1's] IPRs. . . . Should [Defendant 2] irrevocably agree to be bound by the full statutory estoppel provision of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e), including any ground that reasonably could have been raised as part of [Defendant 1's] IPRs, then Defendants are permitted leave to resubmit their Motion within fourteen (14) days of this Order."	

	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd. v. Hanwha Energy Corporation et al 2-24-cv-00262 (EDTX)	May. 05, 2025
District Court Procedural Issues L Stay of Proceedings Infringement Defenses L PTAB Post-Decision Estoppel L PTAB Petitioner Estoppel Following IPR (35 USC § 315(e))		The court granted the parties' renewed joint motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review after all defendants agreed to IPR estoppel. "The Parties previously submitted a motion asking the Court to stay this case pending resolution of the last of the Final Written Decisions for the IPR proceedings instituted on claims of [the patents] that Plaintiff asserts against Defendants. After reviewing that motion, the Court found that Defendants had not made it clear in their motion whether [all Defendants] would be bound by the full statutory estoppel provision of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e). . . . Defendants have since renewed their Motion and irrevocably agreed to be 'estopped to the full extent of 35 U.S.C. § 315, including any ground that reasonably could have been raised as part of [the] IPRs, and to be estopped to the same extent [as Petitioners].'"		