

From: lukasj@gtlaw.com
To: [Ohlert, Andrew \(SEA\); bokare@gtlaw.com; levinsteinm@gtlaw.com; gilfordb@gtlaw.com; Renee.Delcollo@gtlaw.com; Sean.Patchin@gtlaw.com](mailto:Ohlert, Andrew (SEA); bokare@gtlaw.com; levinsteinm@gtlaw.com; gilfordb@gtlaw.com; Renee.Delcollo@gtlaw.com; Sean.Patchin@gtlaw.com)
Cc: [Piepmeier, Sarah \(SFO\); *ImagineAR_Perkins; Metzler@rlf.com; Farnan@RLF.com](mailto:Piepmeier, Sarah (SFO); *ImagineAR_Perkins; Metzler@rlf.com; Farnan@RLF.com)
Subject: RE: ImagineAR v. Niantic, Case No. 24-1252-JDW (D.Del.) - Case Narrowing
Date: Friday, September 19, 2025 4:32:59 PM
Attachments: [Proposed Stipulation to Reduce No. of Claims Grounds\(714795912.1\).docx](#)

Dear Counsel,

Please see the attached draft case narrowing stipulation.

Very truly yours,

James

James J. Lukas, Jr.
Greenberg Traurig, LLP
360 North Green Street | Suite 1300 | Chicago, IL 60607
T +1 312.456.1038 | F +1 312.899.0388
lukasj@gtlaw.com | www.gtlaw.com | [View GT Biography](#)

From: Lukas Jr., James J. (Shld-Chi-IP-Tech)
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Ohlert, Andrew (Perkins Coie) <AOhlert@perkinscoie.com>; Bokar, Erik M. (Assoc-ORL-IP-Tech) <bokare@gtlaw.com>; Levinstein, Matthew J. (Shld-Chi-IP-Tech) <levinsteinm@gtlaw.com>; Gilford, Benjamin P. (Shld-MSP-IP-Tech) <gilfordb@gtlaw.com>; Delcollo, Renee M. (Assoc-DEL-IP-Tech) <Renee.Delcollo@gtlaw.com>; Patchin, Sean (Assoc-CHI-IP-Tech) <Sean.Patchin@gtlaw.com>
Cc: Piepmeier, Sarah (Perkins Coie) <SPiepmeier@perkinscoie.com>; ImagineAR_Perkins@perkinscoie.com; Metzler, Sara M. <Metzler@rlf.com>; Farnan, Kelly E. <Farnan@RLF.com>
Subject: RE: ImagineAR v. Niantic, Case No. 24-1252-JDW (D.Del.) - Case Narrowing

Dear Andrew,

Thank you for your letter. Plaintiffs also believe that the filing of a joint case narrowing stipulation is a good idea and are willing to agree to an appropriate stipulation at the appropriate time. However, Plaintiffs cannot agree to Defendant's proposal because, at the very least, it is unreasonable, premature, and inconsistent with the Joint Rule 26f report, the parties' agreed schedule, and the law. Plaintiffs will provide a suitable proposed case narrowing stipulation for Defendant's review by the end of next week.

Very truly yours,

James

James J. Lukas, Jr.

Greenberg Traurig, LLP

360 North Green Street | Suite 1300 | Chicago, IL 60607

T +1 312.456.1038 | F +1 312.899.0388

lukasj@gtlaw.com | www.gtlaw.com | [View GT Biography](#)

From: Ohlert, Andrew (Perkins Coie) <AOhlert@perkinscoie.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2025 5:39 PM

To: Bokar, Erik M. (Assoc-ORL-IP-Tech) <bokare@gtlaw.com>; Lukas Jr., James J. (Shld-Chi-IP-Tech) <lukasj@gtlaw.com>; Levinstein, Matthew J. (Shld-Chi-IP-Tech) <levinsteinm@gtlaw.com>; Gilford, Benjamin P. (Shld-MSP-IP-Tech) <gilfordb@gtlaw.com>; Delcollo, Renee M. (Assoc-DEL-IP-Tech) <Renee.Delcollo@gtlaw.com>; Patchin, Sean (Assoc-CHI-IP-Tech) <Sean.Patchin@gtlaw.com>

Cc: Piepmeier, Sarah (Perkins Coie) <SPiepmeier@perkinscoie.com>; ImagineAR_Perkins@perkinscoie.com; Metzler, Sara M. <Metzler@rlf.com>; Farnan, Kelly E. <Farnan@RLF.com>

Subject: ImagineAR v. Niantic, Case No. 24-1252-JDW (D.Del.) - Case Narrowing

EXTERNAL TO GT

Counsel,

Please see the attached correspondence.

Regards,

Andrew Ohlert

COUNSEL

Perkins Coie

1301 Second Avenue Suite 4200

Seattle, WA 98101-3804

[+1.206.359.3058](tel:+12063593058)

AOhlert@perkinscoie.com

perkinscoie.com

NOTICE: This communication from Perkins Coie LLP may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

If you are not an intended recipient of confidential and privileged information in this email, please delete it, notify us immediately at postmaster@gtlaw.com, and do not use or disseminate the information.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

IMAGINEAR, INC. and IMAGINE AR, INC.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	C.A. No. 24-1252-JDW
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
NIANTIC, INC.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR THE REDUCTION OF
PLAINTIFFS’ ASSERTED PATENT CLAIMS AND
DEFENDANTS’ ASSERTED PRIOR ART**

WHEREAS Plaintiffs ImagineAR, Inc. and Imagine AR, Inc. (“Plaintiffs”) asserted certain patent claims in their infringement contentions and Defendant Niantic, Inc. (“Defendant”) asserted certain prior art invalidity grounds in its invalidity contentions.

WHEREAS Plaintiffs and Defendant respectfully inform the Court of the following joint stipulation to limit the number of Plaintiffs’ asserted patent claims and Defendant’s asserted prior art invalidity grounds.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by Plaintiffs and Defendant, subject to the approval of the Court, that:

- (i) Plaintiffs will reduce the number of asserted patent claims to no more than 45 claims across all asserted patents and no more than 15 claims from any single patent, no later than fourteen (14) days after the Court’s claim construction order;
- (ii) Defendant will reduce the number of invalidity grounds to no more than three grounds per asserted claim no later than fourteen (14) days after (i) (*i.e.*, Plaintiffs’ initial reduction of asserted patent claims), where each “ground” for purposes of this joint stipulation is either a single prior art reference (anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103) or a specific combination of prior art references (obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103);

- (iii) Plaintiffs will further reduce the number of asserted patent claims to no more than 20 claims across all asserted patents, and no more than ten claims from any single patent, no later than seven (7) days after the close of expert discovery; and
- (iv) Defendant will further reduce the number of invalidity grounds to no more than two grounds per asserted claim (again, where each “ground” for purposes of this joint stipulation is either a single prior art reference (anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103) or a specific combination of prior art references (obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103)), no later than seven (7) days after (iii) (*i.e.*, Plaintiffs’ further reduction of asserted patent claims).

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____ 2025.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE