IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division

AUDIO POD IP, LLC, Plaintiff, v. AMAZON.COM, INC., *et al*, Defendants.	)	Lead Civil Case No. 3:24CV406 (RCY)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to File Its Response/Reply as to ECF No. 114, Defendants' Motion to Transfer Case or in the Alternative Stay ("Motion for Extension," ECF No. 125). Plaintiff's current deadline to respond to the Motion to Transfer is August 18, 2025. However, in the instant Motion for Extension, Plaintiff asks the Court for an 18-day extension, postponing its response deadline to September 5, 2025. Notably, if granted, this extension would postdate the parties' Responsive *Markman* Brief deadline of August 28, 2025, ECF No. 92.

Upon consideration of the parties' respective positions, the Court finds that good cause exists for Plaintiff's extension request. However, the Court also finds persuasive Defendants' argument that resolving the jurisdictional issue should take "top priority" before the Court invests additional time and effort on the claim-construction issues, ECF No. 128 at 1-2. Thus, the Court ORDERS as follows:

(1) Plaintiff's Motion for Extension (ECF No. 125) is GRANTED, but only to the extent it requests additional time to file its response to Defendants' Motion to Transfer. Plaintiff SHALL file its Response to Defendants' Motion to Transfer, ECF No. 114, on or before **September 5, 2025**.

Amazon v. Audio Pod
US Patent 10,735,488
Amazon EX-1115

(2) Defendants SHALL file their Reply to Plaintiff's Response on or before **September 11, 2025**.

(3) Plaintiff's Motion for Extension (ECF No. 125) is DENIED to the extent it requests that the Responsive *Markman* Brief deadline and the *Markman* Hearing date remain intact.[1] The parties' Responsive *Markman* Brief deadline and the *Markman* Hearing are hereby STAYED, pending resolution of the venue issue, or until further order of the Court.

The Clerk is DIRECTED to send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

It is so ORDERED.

/s/ RCY
Roderick C. Young
United States District Judge

Date: August 13, 2025
Richmond, Virginia

[1] Although Plaintiff did not expressly request this relief in its initial Motion, the attendant briefing makes clear that the parties dispute how the Court should prioritize Defendants' Motion to Transfer and the parties' impending claim-construction proceedings. Consequently, the Court's Order resolves this dispute as well.