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

LONGITUDE LICENSING LTD. and MARLIN SEMICONDUCTOR LIMITED, *Plaintiffs*, v. LENOVO GROUP LIMITED, MOTOROLA (WUHAN) MOBILITY TECHNOLOGIES COMMUNICATION COMPANY LIMITED, MOTOROLA MOBILE COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY LTD., ONEPLUS TECHNOLOGY (SHENZHEN) CO., LTD., and TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY LIMITED, *Defendants*.	§ § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § § §	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-CV-171-JRG

ORDER

Before the Court is the Unopposed Motion to Stay Action Pending ITC Determination (the "Motion") filed by Defendants Lenovo Group Limited, Motorola (Wuhan) Mobility Technologies Communication Company Limited, Motorola Mobile Communication Technology Ltd., OnePlus Technology (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., and Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Corporation Limited (Dkt. No. 28). In the Motion, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a), Defendants move to stay the above-captioned case in its entirety pending the final disposition of the United States International Trade Commission ("ITC" or the "Commission") Investigation No. 337-TA-1443 (the "1443 Investigation"). (*Id.* at 1). The Motion is unopposed. (*Id.* at 7).

28 U.S.C. § 1659(a) requires a District Court to stay parallel proceedings "until the determination of the Commission becomes final" if three criteria are met. First, the civil action before the District Court must "involv[e] parties that are also parties to a proceeding before the . . .

Commission." *Id*. Second, the claims for which the stay is requested must "involve[] the same issues involved in the proceeding before the Commission." *Id*. Lastly, the request must be made within the later of either "30 days after the party is named as a respondent in the proceeding before the Commission" or "30 days after the district court action is filed." *Id*.

Here, all three criteria are met. First, the 1446 Investigation includes all of the same parties to the above-captioned case. (Dkt. No. 28, at 2–3). Second, both the 1448 Investigation and the above-captioned case involve the same issues because Plaintiffs allege infringement of the same five patents in both cases. (*Id.*). Third, Defendants' request is timely because it was made on April 18, 2025, which is less than thirty days after the Commission's March 21, 2025 notice of institution of the 1448 Investigation. (*Id.*).

As the statutory requirements for a stay have been met, the Court finds that the Motion should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a), it is **ORDERED** that all action in the above-captioned case is **STAYED** until further Order of this Court. It is further **ORDERED** that the parties shall file a joint notice in this case with attached supporting copies of any dispositive or partially dispositive action within ten (10) days of issuance by the ITC. It is further **ORDERED** that Defendant Lenovo Group's Motion for Extension of Time to Move, Answer, or Otherwise Respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint for Patent Infringement (Dkt. No. 25) is hereby **DENIED AS MOOT**.

So Ordered this

Apr 23, 2025

RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE