

Motion Success Data

8 Results

VIEW IN BROWSER

Judges: James Donato Postures of Motion: Motion by a Party Types of Document: Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review Results of Motion: Granted, Denied in part granted in part

	Type of Document	Result of ...	Case	Date ▼	Appeal Status	
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	BSD Crown, Ltd. f/k/a Emblaze, Ltd. v. Amazon.com Inc. et al 3-24-cv-03503 (NDCA)	Sep. 11, 2025		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Applied Optoelectronics, Inc. v. Cambridge Industries USA, Inc. 3-24-cv-01010 (NDCA)	Apr. 04, 2025		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	WAG Acquisition, L.L.C. v. Netflix, Inc. 3-22-cv-05003 (NDCA)	Mar. 25, 2024		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Google LLC f/k/a Google Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc. 3-21-cv-01468 (NDCA)	Aug. 02, 2023		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied in part granted in part	Broadcom Corporation et al v. Netflix, Inc. 3-20-cv-04677 (NDCA)	Sep. 15, 2021		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Fujinomaki v. Google, LLC et al 3-16-cv-03137 (NDCA)	Mar. 27, 2017		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	REALTIME DATA, LLC d/b/a IXO v. Apple, Inc. 3-16-cv-02595 (NDCA)	Mar. 27, 2017		 
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Toshiba Corporation et al 3-15-cv-02746 (NDCA)	Apr. 07, 2016		 

Overview

VIEW IN BROWSER

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-24-cv-03503 BSD Crown, Ltd. f/k/a Emblaze, Ltd. v. Amazon.com Inc. et al



#93 Description

ORDER. In light of the PTAB's reconsideration of inter partes review, Dkt. Nos. 89, 91, the case is stayed pending further order. All motions are terminated without prejudice to refiling, and all hearing dates are vacated. The parties will jointly advise the Court by November 3, 2025, with respect to the status of inter partes review. Signed by Judge James Donato on 9/11/2025. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc3, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 9/11/2025) (Entered: 09/11/2025)

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-24-cv-01010 Applied Optoelectronics, Inc. v. Cambridge Industries USA, Inc.

#41 Description

ORDER. The parties have advised the Court of the institution of IPR proceedings for a majority of claims in the case. Dkt. No. 40. The case is stayed in all respects pending further order. The claims construction hearing set for April 10, 2025, is vacated. The parties will file a joint status report on the PTAB proceedings every 90 days starting on July 7, 2025. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/4/2025. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc3, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/4/2025) (Entered: 04/04/2025)

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-22-cv-05003 WAG Acquisition, L.L.C. v. Netflix, Inc.



#114 Description

ORDER. For Dkt. No. 113, the parties' recent filings have caused unnecessary confusion about the status of the PTAB proceedings. The stay is re-imposed through May 20, 2024, to allow more time for any request "for rehearing of and/or appeal [of] any of the PTAB's final written decisions." Id. at 1. Signed by Judge James Donato on 3/25/2024. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc1, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 3/25/2024) (Entered: 03/25/2024)

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-21-cv-01468 Google LLC f/k/a Google Inc. v. EcoFactor, Inc.



#74 Description

ORDER. Plaintiff Google's motion to stay, Dkt. No. 71, is granted. In light of ongoing proceedings before the Federal Circuit and the PTO re all four asserted patents, a stay is warranted to conserve party and judicial resources. Defendant EcoFactor's suggestion that it will be prejudiced by a stay, Dkt. No. 72 at 10, is not well taken and the Court finds no likelihood of prejudice in these circumstances. The parties are directed to file a joint status report every 90 days on the progress of the other proceedings, as well as all other lawsuits between Google and EcoFactor that are presently pending before another district court. Signed by Judge James Donato on 8/2/2023. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc3, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 8/2/2023) (Entered: 08/02/2023)

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-20-cv-04677 Broadcom Corporation et al v. Netflix, Inc.



#161 Description

ORDER. In light of the Court's Order re Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. No. 160, it appears that approximately 60% of the remaining asserted claims are not under review by the PTAB. Netflix requested to stay all proceedings pending review by the PTAB, Dkt. No. 109. The Court grants Netflix's request to stay proceedings only as to the patents that are currently the subject of inter partes review by the PTAB. Netflix's request to stay proceedings with respect to patents not under review by the PTAB is denied. Signed by Judge James Donato on 9/15/2021. (This is a text-only entry generated by the court. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc3S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 9/15/2021) (Entered: 09/15/2021)

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-16-cv-03137 Fujinomaki v. Google, LLC et al



#249 Description

ORDER STAYING CASE. In light of the IPR instituted by the PTAB, the case is stayed in its entirety. All pending motions and case management dates are terminated. The parties are directed to advise the Court promptly of the PTAB's disposition of the IPR. Signed by Judge James Donato on 03/27/2017. (Donato, James) (Filed on 3/27/2017) (Entered: 03/27/2017)

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-16-cv-02595 REALTIME DATA, LLC d/b/a IXO v. Apple, Inc.



#85 Description

ORDER STAYING CASE. In light of the IPR instituted by the PTAB, the case is stayed in its entirety. All pending motions and case management dates are terminated. The parties are directed to advise the Court promptly of the PTAB's disposition of the IPR. The clerk is directed to close this case. The closing is for administrative purposes only; nothing in this order will be considered a dismissal or disposition of any claim. Signed by Judge James Donato on 3/27/2017. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc1S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 3/27/2017) (Entered: 03/27/2017)

Annotations	1
Claim Constuctions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

Filers

District Judge James Donato

Overview

[VIEW IN BROWSER](#)

Document: The Document

NDCA 3-15-cv-02747 Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. VIZIO, Inc.

Annotations	1
Claim Constructions	0
Determinations	0
Remedies	0

#69 Description

ORDER STAYING AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASES. For the same reasons articulated in LELO, Inc. v. Standard Innovation (US) Corp., Case No. 13-cv-01393-JD, 2014 WL 2879851 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2014), the Court stays these cases pending completion of the IPRs that have been and may be instituted by the PTAB on the patents-in-suit. The parties jointly represent that "the PTAB has instituted 13 IPR trials to determine the validity of seven of the eight asserted patents" across these five related cases. Dkt. No. 90 at 2. On the single remaining patent, two additional pending IPR petitions are expected to be decided by June 2016. Id. at 21. Because these cases are in their infancy, the IPRs will likely simplify the issues and trial, and plaintiff has not articulated -- and the Court does not see -- any undue prejudice or clear disadvantage that would result from a stay, the Court stays these cases until the PTAB has decided the 13 IPRs that have been instituted (as well as the additional two IPRs, should the PTAB decide to institute those as well). The parties are ordered to file joint status updates every 90 days from the date of this order, and within three days of the PTAB's final written decision on the last IPR to be decided. In light of the length of time the parties expect this process to take (see Dkt. No. 90 at 3 stating that "the PTAB is expected to issue a final written decision within one year of institution"), the Court orders these cases administratively closed in the meantime. The administrative closure is not a decision on the merits, and the cases will be ordered re-opened once the IPR process has concluded and the stays have been lifted. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/7/2016. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc2S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/7/2016) (Entered: 04/07/2016)

NDCA 3-15-cv-02748 Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Apple Inc.**#71 Description**

ORDER STAYING AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASES. For the same reasons articulated in LELO, Inc. v. Standard Innovation (US) Corp., Case No. 13-cv-01393-JD, 2014 WL 2879851 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2014), the Court stays these cases pending completion of the IPRs that have been and may be instituted by the PTAB on the patents-in-suit. The parties jointly represent that "the PTAB has instituted 13 IPR trials to determine the validity of seven of the eight asserted patents" across these five related cases. Dkt. No. 90 at 2. On the single remaining patent, two additional pending IPR petitions are expected to be decided by June 2016. Id. at 21. Because these cases are in their infancy, the IPRs will likely simplify the issues and trial, and plaintiff has not articulated -- and the Court does not see -- any undue prejudice or clear disadvantage that would result from a stay, the Court stays these cases until the PTAB has decided the 13 IPRs that have been instituted (as well as the additional two IPRs, should the PTAB decide to institute those as well). The parties are ordered to file joint status updates every 90 days from the date of this order, and within three days of the PTAB's final written decision on the last IPR to be decided. In light of the length of time the parties expect this process to take (see Dkt. No. 90 at 3 stating that "the PTAB is expected to issue a final written decision within one year of institution"), the Court orders these cases administratively closed in the meantime. The administrative closure is not a decision on the merits, and the cases will be ordered re-opened once the IPR process has concluded and the stays have been lifted. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/7/2016. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc2S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/7/2016) (Entered: 04/07/2016)

NDCA 3-15-cv-02749 Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC**#77 Description**

ORDER STAYING AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASES. For the same reasons articulated in LELO, Inc. v. Standard Innovation (US) Corp., Case No. 13-cv-01393-JD, 2014 WL 2879851 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2014), the Court stays these cases pending completion of the IPRs that have been and may be instituted by the PTAB on the patents-in-suit. The parties jointly represent that "the PTAB has instituted 13 IPR trials to determine the validity of seven of the eight asserted patents" across these five related cases. Dkt. No. 90 at 2. On the single remaining patent, two additional pending IPR petitions are expected to be decided by June 2016. Id. at 21. Because these cases are in their infancy, the IPRs will likely simplify the issues and trial, and plaintiff has not articulated -- and the Court does not see -- any undue prejudice or clear disadvantage that would result from a stay, the Court stays these cases until the PTAB has decided the 13 IPRs that have been instituted (as well as the additional two IPRs, should the PTAB decide to institute those as well). The parties are ordered to file joint status updates every 90 days from the date of this order, and within three days of the PTAB's final written decision on the last IPR to be decided. In light of the length of time the parties expect this process to take (see Dkt. No. 90 at 3 stating that "the PTAB is expected to issue a final written decision within one year of institution"), the Court orders these cases administratively closed in the meantime. The administrative closure is not a decision on the merits, and the cases will be ordered re-opened once the IPR process has concluded and the stays have been lifted. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/7/2016. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc2S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/7/2016) (Entered: 04/07/2016)

NDCA 3-15-cv-02746 Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Toshiba Corporation et al**#92 Description**

ORDER STAYING AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASES. For the same reasons articulated in *LELO, Inc. v. Standard Innovation (US) Corp.*, Case No. 13-cv-01393-JD, 2014 WL 2879851 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2014), the Court stays these cases pending completion of the IPRs that have been and may be instituted by the PTAB on the patents-in-suit. The parties jointly represent that "the PTAB has instituted 13 IPR trials to determine the validity of seven of the eight asserted patents" across these five related cases. Dkt. No. 90 at 2. On the single remaining patent, two additional pending IPR petitions are expected to be decided by June 2016. *Id.* at 21. Because these cases are in their infancy, the IPRs will likely simplify the issues and trial, and plaintiff has not articulated -- and the Court does not see -- any undue prejudice or clear disadvantage that would result from a stay, the Court stays these cases until the PTAB has decided the 13 IPRs that have been instituted (as well as the additional two IPRs, should the PTAB decide to institute those as well). The parties are ordered to file joint status updates every 90 days from the date of this order, and within three days of the PTAB's final written decision on the last IPR to be decided. In light of the length of time the parties expect this process to take (see Dkt. No. 90 at 3 stating that "the PTAB is expected to issue a final written decision within one year of institution"), the Court orders these cases administratively closed in the meantime. The administrative closure is not a decision on the merits, and the cases will be ordered re-opened once the IPR process has concluded and the stays have been lifted. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/7/2016. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc2S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/7/2016) (Entered: 04/07/2016)

NDCA 3-15-cv-02750 Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Microsoft Mobile, Inc.,

#94 Description

ORDER STAYING AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING CASES. For the same reasons articulated in *LELO, Inc. v. Standard Innovation (US) Corp.*, Case No. 13-cv-01393-JD, 2014 WL 2879851 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2014), the Court stays these cases pending completion of the IPRs that have been and may be instituted by the PTAB on the patents-in-suit. The parties jointly represent that "the PTAB has instituted 13 IPR trials to determine the validity of seven of the eight asserted patents" across these five related cases. Dkt. No. 90 at 2. On the single remaining patent, two additional pending IPR petitions are expected to be decided by June 2016. *Id.* at 21. Because these cases are in their infancy, the IPRs will likely simplify the issues and trial, and plaintiff has not articulated -- and the Court does not see -- any undue prejudice or clear disadvantage that would result from a stay, the Court stays these cases until the PTAB has decided the 13 IPRs that have been instituted (as well as the additional two IPRs, should the PTAB decide to institute those as well). The parties are ordered to file joint status updates every 90 days from the date of this order, and within three days of the PTAB's final written decision on the last IPR to be decided. In light of the length of time the parties expect this process to take (see Dkt. No. 90 at 3 stating that "the PTAB is expected to issue a final written decision within one year of institution"), the Court orders these cases administratively closed in the meantime. The administrative closure is not a decision on the merits, and the cases will be ordered re-opened once the IPR process has concluded and the stays have been lifted. Signed by Judge James Donato on 4/7/2016. (This is a text-only entry. There is no document associated with this entry.) (jdlc2S, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/7/2016) (Entered: 04/07/2016)

Filers

District Judge James Donato