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

ADVANCED INTEGRATED CIRCUIT PROCESS LLC, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **UNITED MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION,** **Defendant.**	**Case No.: 2:24-cv-00730-JRG** **(Lead Case)**
ADVANCED INTEGRATED CIRCUIT PROCESS LLC, **Plaintiff,** **v.** **TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY LIMITED,** **Defendant.**	**Civil Action No.: 2:24-cv-623**

DEFENDANT TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY LIMITED'S MOTION TO STAY PENDING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 1

III. LEGAL STANDARD 4

IV. A STAY PENDING IPR AT THIS STAGE WILL SIGNIFICANTLY SIMPLIFY ISSUES WITHOUT CAUSING UNDUE PREJUDICE 5

A. A Stay Will Significantly Simplify or Eliminate Issues 5

B. AICP Will Not Suffer Undue Prejudice from a Stay 8

C. The Stage of the Case Weighs in Favor of a Stay 10

V. CONCLUSION 11

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 14

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.,
856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....7

Customedia Techs. v. Dish Network Corp.,
2017 WL 3836123 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2017) 4

Cywee Grp. Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,
2019 WL 11023976 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 14, 2019) 11

Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.,
2016 WL 1162162 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 23, 2016) 4

Finjan, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.,
139 F. Supp. 3d 1032 (N.D. Cal. 2015) 5

Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Bitco General Ins. Corp.,
2016 WL 4394485 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....5

Landmark Tech., LLC v. iRobot Corp.,
2014 WL 486836 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 24, 2014).....9

Netlist, Inc. v. Micron Tech., Inc.,
2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106857 (W.D. Tex. June 17, 2024) 4

NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am., Inc.,
2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015) ..... passim

Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. TP-Link Techs., Co.,
2014 WL 5035718 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2014) 11

Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC,
584 U.S. 325 (2018).....9

Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.,
2017 WL 9885168 (E.D. Tex. June 13, 2017).....5

VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.,
759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....8, 9, 10

Wi-LAN, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
2018 WL 2392161 (S.D. Cal. May 22, 2018).....5

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....3

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Changes to Implement Inter Partes Review Proceedings, Post-Grant Review Proceedings, and Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents, 77 Fed. Reg. 48680 (Aug. 14, 2012) (codified at 37 C.F.R. pt. 42) 10

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Ex.[1]	Document
1	Advanced Integrated Circuit Process, LLC's Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions and P.R.3-2 Document Production against TSMC (Cover Pleading), served January 7, 2025
2	Advanced Integrated Circuit Process, LLC's First Amended P.R. 1 Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions and P.R. 3-2 Documents Production against TSMC (Cover Pleading), served February 5, 2025
3	IPR2025-00683; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 8,907,425 (Paper 1), filed March 26, 2025
4	IPR2025-00682; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 8,198,686 (Paper 1), filed March 28, 2025
5	IPR2025-00828; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 7,579,227 (Paper 1), filed April 15, 2025
6	IPR2025-00829; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 7,923,764 (Paper 1), filed April 15, 2025
7	IPR2025-00830; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 8,253,180 (Paper 1), filed April 15, 2025
8	IPR2025-00831; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 8,587,076 (Paper 1), filed April 15, 2025
9	IPR2025-00832; *TSMC v. Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC*, Petition for Inter Partes Review on U.S. Patent 8,796,779 (Paper 1), filed April 11, 2025
10	Lex Machina *Inter Partes* Review statistics for Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd.
11	Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC's Franchise Tax Account Status, *available at* https://comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/franchise/account-status/search/32095493097
12	Patent Assignment Cover Sheet and Assignment from Nuvoton Technology Corporation Japan to Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC, available at http://legacy-assignments.uspto.gov/assignments/assignment-pat-68118-314.pdf
13	Correspondence from Iman Lordgooei to Justin Nelson regarding Notice regarding Unmarked Products, dated March 11, 2025

[1] Exhibit numbers refer to the numbered exhibits attached to the declaration of James Quigley.

LIST OF COMMON ABBREVIATIONS IN THIS BRIEF

AICP	Plaintiff Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC
TSMC	Defendant Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited
'227 patent	U.S. Patent No. 7,579,227
'764 patent	U.S. Patent No. 7,923,764
'686 patent	U.S. Patent No. 8,198,686
'180 patent	U.S. Patent No. 8,253,180
'076 patent	U.S. Patent No. 8,587,076
'779 patent	U.S. Patent No. 8,796,779
'425 patent	U.S. Patent No. 8,907,425
Asserted Patents	Collectively, the '227 patent, '764 patent, '686 patent, '180 patent, '076 patent, '779 patent, and '425 patent
IPR	*Inter partes* review
PTAB	Patent Trial and Appeal Board
PTO	Patent and Trademark Office

I. INTRODUCTION

TSMC respectfully moves the Court to stay this litigation until the conclusion of *inter partes* review of all seven Asserted Patents in this case. TSMC diligently filed IPR petitions challenging all asserted claims of the Asserted Patents while this case is still in its early stages. Indeed, the *Markman* hearing is scheduled in December 2025; fact and expert discovery do not close until the first half of 2026; and the June 22, 2026 trial date is more than a year away. The IPRs will also have substantial streamlining effect on this early-stage litigation by significantly narrowing the number of asserted patents, asserted claims, prior art references, and claim construction issues. In contrast, AICP faces no prejudice from a stay because it manufactures no products and is not a competitor of TSMC. If any part of this case remains after the conclusion of the IPRs, AICP would be able to proceed here with its claim for monetary damages. Accordingly, the traditional factors governing the propriety of a stay—the simplification of pending issues, state of the proceedings, and risk of undue prejudice to the plaintiff—all favor granting a stay.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On September 6, 2024, Plaintiff Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC ("AICP") filed its complaint in which it asserted seven patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 7,579,227 (the "'227 patent"), 7,923,764 (the "'764 patent"), 8,198,686 (the "'686 patent"), 8,253,180 (the "'180 patent"), 8,587,076 (the "'076 patent"), 8,796,779 (the "'779 patent"), and 8,907,425 (the "'425 patent") (collectively, the "Asserted Patents"). Member Case No. 2:24-cv-00623-JRG, Dkt. 1 ("Complaint") ¶ 34. On January 7, 2025, AICP served its infringement contentions asserting:

- claims 1-2, 7-8, and 14 of the '227 patent,
- claims 1-6 and 11-19 of the '764 patent,
- claims 25-29, 31, and 34-35 of the '686 patent,

- claims 1-3, 5-6, 11, 13-14, 16-19, and 21-22 of the ’180 patent,
- claims 1-3, 6-8, and 10-13 of the ’076 patent,
- claims 1 and 12-15 of the ’779 patent, and
- claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 11 of the ’425 patent.

Ex. 1 at 2. On February 5, 2025, AICP served amended infringement contentions that asserted the same claims. Ex. 2 at 2. On February 20, 2025, AICP filed an unopposed motion for leave regarding these infringement contentions. Dkt. 54.[2] This Court granted AICP’s motion for leave on February 21, 2025. Dkt. 56.

Until AICP served its initial and amended infringement contentions, few substantive activities had occurred in this case, other than jurisdictional and venue-related discovery. Specifically, before AICP even served its initial infringement contentions, TSMC filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction or, in the alternative, to transfer, on November 29, 2024. Member Case No. 2:24-cv-00623-JRG, Dkt. 26. On January 2, 2025, the Court granted AICP’s motion for leave to take jurisdictional discovery. Dkt. 42. On March 17, 2025, TSMC moved to withdraw the portion of its motion that sought to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction but maintained the portion of its motion that sought to transfer. Dkt. 66. This Court granted the motion for partial withdrawal on March 20, 2025. Dkt. 70. TSMC answered AICP’s complaint on March 31, 2025. Dkt. 75. On April 17, 2025, TSMC filed a motion to strike and compel supplemental infringement contentions from AICP for failing to satisfy the District’s Patent Rules. Dkt. 90.

While these jurisdictional and venue-related activities were ongoing, TSMC was diligently preparing IPR petitions against AICP’s Asserted Patents. About two and a half months after receiving AICP’s initial infringement contentions, TSMC filed its first IPR petition on March 26,

[2] Docket entries refer to lead case, No. 2:24-cv-00730-JRG, unless stated otherwise.

2025. Ex. 3. By April 15, 2025—within three months and eight days after AICP served its initial infringement contentions—TSMC filed all of its IPR petitions challenging all asserted claims from all seven Asserted Patents. The following table summarizes these petitions, related dates, and claims challenged:

IPR Case No.	Patent	Challenged Claims	Actual Filing Date	Notice of Filing Date Accorded	Institution Decision Deadline
IPR2025-00682	’686	1-35 (All)	March 28, 2025	April 18, 2025	October 18, 2025
IPR2025-00683	’425	1-15 (All)	March 26, 2025	April 18, 2025	October 18, 2025
IPR2025-00828	’227	1-3, 6-9, 14	April 15, 2025	Not yet available	Not yet available
IPR2025-00829	’764	1-21 (All)	April 15, 2025	Not yet available	Not yet available
IPR2025-00830	’180	1-22 (All)	April 15, 2025	Not yet available	Not yet available
IPR2025-00831	’076	1-13 (All)	April 15, 2025	Not yet available	Not yet available
IPR2025-00832	’779	1, 8-15	April 11, 2025	Not yet available	Not yet available

All seven IPR petitions are attached as Exhibits 3-9. TSMC expects that the PTAB will begin issuing its institution decisions on TSMC’s petitions by October 2025, with final decisions in the seven IPR proceedings expected to issue within one year of each petition’s institution date. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).

This case is still in its early stages. TSMC’s motion to transfer is still pending, and jurisdictional and venue discovery related to that motion are not set to close until June 30, 2025. Dkt. 84. The May 1, 2025 deadline for serving TSMC’s invalidity contentions has not yet passed. Dkt. 83 at 6. All of the major milestones in this case are many months away: the *Markman* hearing is set for December 18, 2025, which is months after the expected IPR institution decisions; fact discovery is set to close on January 29, 2026; expert discovery ends on March 12, 2026; and dispositive motions are due March 17, 2026. Dkt. 83 at 4-5. The June 22, 2026 trial start date is more than a year away. *Id*. at 2.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

The Court "has the inherent power to control its own docket, including the power to stay proceedings before it." *Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.*, 2016 WL 1162162, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 23, 2016). In determining how to manage its docket, the district court "must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance." *Customedia Techs. v. Dish Network Corp.*, 2017 WL 3836123, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2017).

This inherent authority to stay an action applies where issues presented can be resolved in a pending IPR. A stay pending IPR proceedings is especially justified where the outcome of the proceedings will likely simplify the case by helping the court determine validity issues or eliminating the need to try infringement issues. *See id*. at *2 (granting stay where the PTAB "instituted IPRs as to all but one of the asserted claims" because "a stay has the potential to decrease the burdens on the Court and the parties, and any potential costs, delay, or prejudice resulting from postponing the resolution of the case are outweighed by the benefits of a stay").

When deciding whether to stay a case pending IPR, the court will consider "(1) whether the stay will unduly prejudice the nonmoving party, (2) whether the proceedings before the court have reached an advanced stage, including whether discovery is complete and a trial date has been set, and (3) whether the stay will likely result in simplifying the case before the court." *NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am., Inc.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *2 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015). "Based on those factors, courts determine whether the benefits of a stay outweigh the inherent costs of postponing resolution of the litigation." *Id.*

Other courts have granted stays while institution decisions from the PTAB are pending, particularly when the IPRs will clarify and streamline the issues. *See, e.g., Netlist, Inc. v. Micron Tech., Inc.*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106857, at *5 (W.D. Tex. June 17, 2024) (indicating that defendant's stay pending IPR before institution was granted because "Micron's IPR petitions

covered all asserted claims in each Asserted Patent in the two cases and thus, the PTAB's decisions would significantly streamline the issues before the Court." (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Finjan, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.*, 139 F. Supp. 3d 1032, 1037-38 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (granting stay "pending a decision by the PTO concerning whether to institute IPR" and noting "[w]ere the Court to deny the stay until a decision on institution is made, the parties and the Court would expend significant resources on issues that could eventually be mooted by the IPR decision"); *Wi-LAN, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.*, 2018 WL 2392161, at *2 (S.D. Cal. May 22, 2018) (granting a stay "pending the PTO's decisions regarding institution of [Defendant's] IPR petitions" finding that a "stay would further promote the interest of justice and judicial economy").

IV. A STAY PENDING IPR AT THIS STAGE WILL SIGNIFICANTLY SIMPLIFY ISSUES WITHOUT CAUSING UNDUE PREJUDICE

The three factors governing this motion favor granting TSMC's stay request even before TSMC's IPR petitions have been instituted or finally decided. Granting a stay will simplify, if not completely dispose of, the issues before the Court, without causing any prejudice to AICP, and conserve this Court's and the parties' resources given the early stage of the case.

A. A Stay Will Significantly Simplify or Eliminate Issues

As this Court has explained, "***the most important factor*** bearing on whether to grant a stay in this case ***is the prospect*** that the inter partes review proceeding will result in simplification of the issues before the Court." *NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *4;[3] *see also Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Bitco General Ins. Corp.*, 2016 WL 4394485, at *3 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016). "A stay is particularly justified when the outcome of a PTO proceeding is likely to assist the court in determining patent validity or eliminate the need to try infringement issues." *NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111 at *1 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Am.,*

[3] All emphasis added throughout this brief unless otherwise noted.

Inc., 2017 WL 9885168, at *1 (E.D. Tex. June 13, 2017) ("[E]ven if the PTAB does not invalidate every claim on which it has instituted IPR, there is a significant likelihood that the outcome of the IPR proceedings will streamline the scope of this case to an appreciable extent."). A stay here may eliminate all the issues in this litigation.

The pending IPR petitions address every asserted claim in all seven Asserted Patents. *See supra* Part II. Thus, resolution of the IPR petitions will not only simplify the issues but may potentially dispose of this entire case. This is especially true here where TSMC has a stellar track record of institution in IPR proceedings. Of TMSC's IPR proceedings between September 16, 2012 and April 19, 2025, 67 IPR petitions[4] reached the institution stage, where the PTAB instituted 91% (61) of these petitions and only declined to institute 9% (6) of them. Ex. 10 at 1. All of the instituted petitions resulted in unpatentable claims, amended claims, patent owner disclaimer, settlement, or joinder with other trials, which also all resulted in unpatentable claims or settlement. *Id.* The frequency of settlement during the IPR process also increases the likelihood of streamlining this action. Even if rare, the Court should stay this case prior to institution in view of TSMC's proven track record of successful IPR petitions. Doing so would avoid unnecessarily litigating this case until October 2025 and would also preserve the Court's time ruling on the disputes raised by the parties to date. Thus, if the Court stays this case and the PTAB later invalidates the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents in the IPR proceedings, the Court and the parties (including parties in consolidated member cases) will have saved significant costs, time, and resources that they would otherwise expend in this case.

[4] Of the remaining IPR petitions that have not yet or did not reach the institution stage, 12 petitions are still pending, and the other 34 have settled or otherwise been dismissed. Ex. 10 at 1.

Even if only some of the claims are invalidated, the IPR proceedings will inform this Court on issues of claim construction that may impact infringement and invalidity. *See NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *7 (determining that even where all claims were not reviewed during IPR proceedings, "any disposition by the PTAB is likely to simplify the proceedings before this Court"); *see also Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, 856 F.3d 1353, 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (holding that "statements made by a patent owner during an IPR proceeding, whether before or after an institution decision, can be relied upon to support a finding of prosecution disclaimer"). By granting TSMC's motion to stay, the Court can avoid spending time on claim construction issues that may become moot if the PTAB finds certain claims invalid or that may require further analysis due to AICP's IPR-related arguments or amendments impacting claim scope.

And even in the unlikely event where TSMC's IPRs are instituted but ultimately unsuccessful, TSMC will be estopped from re-arguing invalidity to the jury based on grounds that TSMC raised, or reasonably could have raised, at the PTAB. *See NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *4 ("If the proceedings before the PTAB result in confirmation of the patent claims being asserted in court, the defendant will be estopped from challenging the validity of the claims on any ground that was, or could reasonably have been, asserted in the inter partes proceeding."). In each of the IPR petitions, TSMC already stipulated that "if IPR is instituted, Petitioner will not pursue in the related district court proceeding any ground that Petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised against the challenged claims during the instituted IPR." Ex. 3 at 111; Ex. 4 at 101; Ex. 5 at 66-67; Ex. 6 at 101; Ex. 7 at 104-05; Ex. 8 at 106-07; Ex. 9 at 85. Regardless of the IPRs' outcome, the scope of the case will be narrowed by TSMC's IPR petitions.

Given the streamlining effect of TSMC's IPR petitions, granting TSMC's motion to stay now would allow the parties and the Court to avoid the burden and expense of the claim construction briefing and hearing process, which has not yet begun.

B. AICP Will Not Suffer Undue Prejudice from a Stay

The second stay factor considers "whether the patentee will be unduly prejudiced by a stay in the district court proceedings [and] focuses on the patentee's need for an expeditious resolution of its claim." *VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.*, 759 F.3d 1307, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2014). Here, AICP will not suffer undue prejudice if the Court stays the case.

Monetary relief would sufficiently compensate AICP, because it does not manufacture any integrated circuits itself and does not otherwise compete with TSMC in the semiconductor industry. *See NFC Tech.*, 215 WL 1069111, at *3 (recognizing that plaintiff's concession it "does not compete with [defendant] and that monetary relief will be sufficient to compensate it for any injury to its patent rights" weighs against prejudice). For any purported damages, a "stay will not diminish the monetary damages to which [AICP] will be entitled if it succeeds in its infringement suit—it only delays realization of those damages . . . ." *VirtualAgility*, 759 F.3d at 1318. As this Court has determined, a delay of the vindication of patent rights alone cannot defeat a motion to stay. *E.g., NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *2. This determination is even more true here because AICP has only existed since June 12, 2024, Ex. 11, about one month before it obtained the Asserted Patents, Ex. 12, and about three months before it filed its complaint, Member Case No. 2:24-cv-00623-JRG, Dkt. 1. In fact, TSMC sent AICP an *Arctic Cat* letter informing AICP that it failed to mark products believed to practice at least one claim of the Asserted Patents, to which AICP has not responded. Ex. 13. Thus, AICP has not met its burden of showing it is entitled to any past damages, further lessening any risk of prejudice to AICP.

In contrast, TSMC will suffer undue prejudice without a stay. Without a stay, TSMC will incur the burden and significant cost of continuing to defend against infringement allegations of 63 patent claims across seven patents that the PTAB may ultimately invalidate.

Against the undue prejudice facing TSMC, AICP may argue that a stay could delay its possible recovery of monetary damages. But this argument ignores that the public too has a "paramount interest in seeing that patent monopolies are kept within their legitimate scope." *Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp., LLC*, 584 U.S. 325, 336-37 (2018). The Supreme Court has, indeed, recognized the policy rationale of protecting the public's interest in giving the Patent Office a second look:

> Inter partes review is a second look at an earlier administrative grant of a patent. . . . So, like the PTO's initial review, the Board's inter partes review protects the public's paramount interest in seeing that patent monopolies are kept within their legitimate scope. Thus, inter partes review involves the same interests as the determination to grant a patent in the first instance.
>
> The primary distinction between inter partes review and the initial grant of a patent is that inter partes review occurs *after* the patent has issued. But that distinction does not make a difference here. Patent claims are granted subject to the qualification that the PTO has the authority to reexamine—and perhaps cancel—a patent claim in an inter partes review.

Id. (emphasis in original) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Just like it would be inefficient to begin litigation of patents that have yet to issue, it is similarly inefficient to continue litigating patents of a case in its early stages that the Patent Office has not double checked. When the Patent Office has time to take a second look at the invalidity of the Asserted Patents before this case begins in earnest, there is no ***undue*** prejudice to AICP in granting the stay to ensure it has not monopolized something already belonging to the public. *See VirtualAgility*, 759 F.3d at 1318 ("We conclude that the district court clearly erred in finding that the undue prejudice factor weighed heavily against a stay."); *Landmark Tech., LLC v. iRobot Corp.*, 2014 WL 486836, at *4

(E.D. Tex. Jan. 24, 2014) ("While a delay in proceeding with its case may be somewhat prejudicial to Landmark, it is not ***unduly*** prejudicial.").

A stay may well benefit both sides in this litigation. While TSMC may benefit from the asserted claims being invalidated in the IPR proceedings, AICP may benefit from IPR estoppel of invalidity grounds if the claims are not invalidated. *NFC Tech.*, 2015 WL 1069111, at *4. Rather than cause prejudice, a stay will benefit both parties by allowing them to benefit from the IPR system that Congress intended to aid courts as an essential part of an "efficient and streamlined patent system that will improve patent quality and limit unnecessary and counterproductive litigation costs." *Changes to Implement Inter Partes Review Proceedings, Post-Grant Review Proceedings, and Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents*, 77 Fed. Reg. 48680 (Aug. 14, 2012) (codified at 37 C.F.R. pt. 42). This is particularly true here, where TSMC promptly filed its IPR petitions, well before the one-year statutory deadline.

C. The Stage of the Case Weighs in Favor of a Stay

TSMC has diligently pursued IPRs since the early stages of this case. TSMC filed its IPRs before the deadline for serving its invalidity contentions and months before jurisdictional and venue discovery related to its motion to transfer are scheduled to close.

The major milestones in this litigation remain in the future. The claim construction hearing is not set until December 2025, Dkt. 83 at 5, months after the anticipated institution decisions in the IPR proceedings. The close of fact discovery is set for January of 2026. *Id.* Expert discovery has not begun, and summary judgment is eleven months away. *Id.* at 4. With the claim construction hearing not set until the middle of December and the end of fact discovery not until January 2026, this case is at an ideal stage for a stay. *See VirtualAgility*, 759 F.3d at 1317 (determining that a stay pending administrative review is proper where "there remained eight

months of fact discovery, the joint claim construction statements had yet to be filed, and jury selection was a year away").

Further, the June 22, 2026 trial date is more than a year away. Dkt. 83 at 2. Because more than a year of work remains in this case before jury selection, this fact favors the grant of TSMC's request for a stay. *See, e.g.*, *Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. TP-Link Techs., Co.*, 2014 WL 5035718, at *3 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2014) ("Courts often find the stage of litigation weighs in favor of a stay if there remains a significant amount of work ahead for the parties and the court, even when the parties and/or the court have already devoted substantial resources to the litigation.").

In sum, at this point, "[t]he most burdensome parts of the case . . . all lie in the future." *Cywee Grp. Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 2019 WL 11023976, at *6 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 14, 2019). A stay would avoid the undue expenses of litigating this case, including the risk of relitigating claim construction and engaging in unnecessary discovery, given that the PTAB's final decisions may dispose of the entire case.

V. CONCLUSION

For all the reasons above, TSMC respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion to stay this case until final decisions are rendered in the IPRs currently pending at the PTAB with respect to the Asserted Patents. In the alternative, should the Court decide that this case does not justify a stay at this time, TSMC requests that the Court deny this motion without prejudice and order expedited briefing on TSMC's anticipated post-institution stay motion after the PTAB issues its institution decisions.

Dated: April 28, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Jennifer Truelove*

Jennifer Truelove
Texas State Bar No. 24012906
jtruelove@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
104 E. Houston Street, Suite 300
Marshall, Texas 75670
Telephone: (903) 923-9000
Facsimile: (903) 923-9099

James E. Quigley
Texas State Bar No. 24075810
jquigley@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
303 Colorado Street Suite 2100
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone: (512) 692-8700
Telecopier: (512) 692-8744

Karrie Wheatley
Texas Bar No. 24098605
Tony Nguyen
Texas Bar No. 24083565
Jacqueline Moran
Texas Bar No. 24121740
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
909 Fannin Street, Suite 2100
Houston, TX 77010
Telephone: (713) 654-5300
Facsimile: (713) 652-0109
wheatley@fr.com
nguyen@fr.com
jtmoran@fr.com

Michael J. McKeon
DC Bar No. 459780
Christian Chu
DC Bar No. 483948
Benjamin Christoff
DC Bar No. 1025635
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1000 Maine Avenue, S.W., Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20024
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
mckeon@fr.com
chu@fr.com
christoff@fr.com

Kevin Su
MA Bar No. 663726
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
One Marina Park Drive
Boston, MA 02210
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906
su@fr.com

James Huguenin-Love
MN Bar No. 0398706
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200

Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696
huguenin-love@fr.com

Karolina Jesien (*pro hac vice*)
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
7 Times Square, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10036
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291
jesien@fr.com

Sean Pak (*pro hac vice*)
CA Bar No. 219032
Iman Lordgooei
CA Bar. No. 251320-CA
Kevin (Gyushik) Jang
NY Bar No. 5391354
Jodie Cheng (*pro hac vice*)
CA Bar No. 292330
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
seanpak@quinnemanuel.com
imanlordgooei@quinnemanuel.com
kevinjang@quinnemanuel.com
jodiecheng@quinnemanuel.com

Conrad Gosen (*pro hac vice*)
MN Bar No. 395381
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
1109 1st Ave, Suite 210
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 905-7000
Facsimile: (206) 905-7100
conradgosen@quinnemanuel.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING CORPORATION LIMITED

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic services are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) on April 28, 2025.

/s/ Jennifer Truelove
Jennifer Truelove

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the parties have complied with the meet and confer requirement of Local Rule CV-7(h). The parties' counsel met, conferred and confirmed an impasse as of April 25, 2025 as to the relief sought in this motion.

/s/ Jennifer Truelove
Jennifer Truelove