

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION

|                      |   |                           |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| USTA TECHNOLOGY, LLC | § |                           |
|                      | § |                           |
| v.                   | § | CIVIL NO. 4:24-CV-515-SDJ |
|                      | § |                           |
| LENOVO GROUP LIMITED | § |                           |

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the parties' Joint Disputed Motion for Entry of Proposed Jurisdictional Discovery Order. (Dkt. #63). This motion was filed in response to the Court's previous Order on Jurisdictional Discovery. (Dkt. #58).

In that Order, the Court explained what jurisdictional discovery was required to be produced by Defendant Lenovo Group Limited ("LGL") and by when: "Within two weeks of this Order, LGL shall produce jurisdictional discovery, including written discovery responses, transcript of depositions of witnesses, and document productions related to personal jurisdiction," for a set of five related cases. (Dkt. #58 at 2). And within two weeks of that production, the parties needed to "submit a joint proposal for any additional, non-duplicative discovery needed, if any." (Dkt. #58 at 2).

LGL claims that it produced the requested documents on May 5, 2025. (Dkt. #63 at 3). But certain files needed to be reproduced because of technical issues, so "the parties treated LGL's production as complete by May 19, 2025." (Dkt. #63 at 3). The parties' joint proposal therefore needed to be filed with the Court by June 2, 2025. But that proposal was filed over a month late on July 14, 2025. *See* (Dkt. #63).

As USTA admits, “[f]or a variety of reasons, neither party provided a proposed schedule until USTA did so on July 3, 2025.” (Dkt. #63 at 1). And USTA says nothing about why it failed to respond to LGL’s requests for USTA’s “opening proposal for any additional jurisdictional discovery on June 2, June 3, June 9, June 16, and June 24.” (Dkt. #63 at 1). The Court therefore finds that USTA forfeited its right to seek additional discovery by failing to timely comply with this Court’s Order. (Dkt. #58).

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the parties’ Joint Disputed Motion for Entry of Proposed Jurisdictional Discovery Order, (Dkt. #63), is **DENIED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that jurisdictional discovery is deemed complete for purposes of the parties’ proposed response deadlines for LGL’s Motion to Dismiss and Strike the Second Amended Complaint. (Dkt. #43). Any jurisdictional discovery requests made after June 2, 2025, and pursuant to this Court’s prior order, are a nullity and need not be answered.

It is further **ORDERED** that USTA shall file its response to LGL’s Motion to Dismiss by **July 30, 2025**. LGL shall file its reply up to and including fourteen days after USTA’s response is filed.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 15th day of July, 2025.**

  
SEAN D. JORDAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE