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

GHENGISCOMM HOLDINGS, LLC, *Plaintiff*, v. SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., *Defendant.*	§ § § § § § § § § § § § §	Case No. 2:24-cv-00242-RWS-RSP

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Stay Pending Post-Grant Proceedings, filed by Defendants Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.. **Dkt. No. 49**. In this case, Plaintiff asserts that Defendant infringes United States Patent Nos. 9,768,842; 10,200,227; 10,389,568; 11,075,786; 11,223,508; 11,252,005; 11,381,285; and 11,424,792. Dkt. No. 1 at 1. In the Motion, Defendant moves the Court to stay this case in view of post-grant proceedings covering the asserted patents, which include *ex-parte* reexaminations and *inter partes* reviews as summarized in the table below:

Petitioner/ Requester	**Patent**	**Claims**	**EPR/IPR No.**	**Filing Date**	**Filing Date Accorded/Status**
Unified Patents	'227	1-7, 9-29	90/019,411	Feb. 9, 2024	Claims finally rejected, and appeal fully briefed
Samsung[2]	'005	13, 18, 19	90/019,847	Feb. 11, 2025	Reexamination ordered
Samsung	'792	8, 9, 10	90/019,848	Feb. 11, 2025	Reexamination ordered

Samsung v. GenghisComm
IPR2025-00789, 11,075,768
GC EX2002

Samsung	’842	1-3, 4, 7-9, 11, 17-18, 22, 25-26, 28	IPR2025-00780	March 28, 2025	April 18, 2025
Samsung	’227	1-3, 7, 11, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24- 26, 28	IPR2025-00781	March 28, 2025	April 18, 2025
Samsung	’568	1-3, 6, 10-11, 20, 24-26, 29, 32-34, 44, 47	IPR2025-00788	April 1, 2025	May 7, 2025
Samsung	’786	1, 2, 6-11, 15-20, and 24-27	IPR2025-00789	April 2, 2025	May 7, 2025
Samsung	’508	1-6, 9-14, 17-22	IPR2025-00790	April 10, 2025	May 7, 2025
Samsung	’005	1, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 30, 31, 33-35	IPR2025-00791	April 7, 2025	May 7, 2025
Samsung	’285	1, 2, 6, 7, 9-12, 16, 17, 19-22, 26, 27, 29, 30	IPR2025-00792	April 7, 2025	May 7, 2025
Samsung	’792	1-3, 5, 8-10, 12, 15-17, 19	IPR2025-00793	April 10, 2025	May 7, 2025

After consideration, the motion is **DENIED** as premature.

The “universal practice” in this District, as well as the practice of most district courts, is to deny a motion for stay when the Patent Trial and Appeal Board has not yet acted on a petition for *inter partes* review. *Trover*, 2015 WL 1069179, at *6 (collecting cases); *see also Peloton Interactive*, 2019 WL 3826051, at *2 (citation omitted). The reasoning behind this is that unless the Board indicates there is a serious chance it will invalidate all the asserted claims, the Court will not needlessly wait to rule on the remaining asserted claims.

Samsung v. GenghisComm
IPR2025-00789, 11,075,768
GC EX2002

Here, the Board has not instituted *inter partes* review on several of the asserted patents in this case, with these patents (*e.g.*, the '842 Patent[1]) also not being the subject of any other post-grant proceeding. *See* Dkt. No. 49 at 2.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Samsung's Motion as premature.

SIGNED this 19th day of May, 2025.

ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

[1] *See* United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Case Tracking System, United States Patent No. 9,768,842 (May 19, 2025), https://ptacts.uspto.gov/ptacts/ui/public-search.

Samsung v. GenghisComm
IPR2025-00789, 11,075,768
GC EX2002