Documents Search

45 Results

Judges: Rodney Gilstrap, Roy S. Payne **Document Filing Date:** On or After Dec. 8th, 2023 **Postures of Motion:** Motion by a Party, Ex Parte / Emergency **Types of Document:** Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review **Results of Motion:** Granted, Denied

Type of Document	Result of ...	Case	Date	Appeal Status
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	WellcomeMat, LLC v. Aylo Holdings Sarl et al 2-23-cv-00483 (EDTX)	Oct. 17, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	WellcomeMat, LLC v. Aylo Holdings Sarl et al 2-23-cv-00483 (EDTX)	Oct. 02, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Advanced Memory Technologies, LLC v. SK Hynix Inc. 2-24-cv-01078 (EDTX)	Sep. 03, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Advanced Integrated Circuit Process LLC v. United Microelectronics Corporation 2-24-cv-00730 (EDTX)	Aug. 28, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Anonymous Media Research Holdings LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00439 (EDTX)	Aug. 04, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Cerence Operating Company v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-24-cv-00181 (EDTX)	Aug. 04, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	WellcomeMat, LLC v. Aylo Holdings Sarl et al 2-23-cv-00483 (EDTX)	Aug. 04, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Resonant Systems, Inc. d/b/a RevelHMI v. Nintendo Co., Ltd. 2-25-cv-00090 (EDTX)	Jul. 28, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "Given that the PTAB is expected to issue its final written decision more than a year before this case goes to trial, and given that Defendant has stipulated to be bound by [another petitioner's] arguments in that IPR, it is *likely* that the PTAB's decision will simply the issues in this case. . . . The fact that this Defendant has been prompt supports this Motion in a material way. In fact, Defendant filed its IPR petition just thirty-eight days after Plaintiff filed suit. The parties had not yet invested resources into the discovery process, nor had the Court yet invested resources into claim construction. . . . While Plaintiff is correct that the PTAB's final written decision might not issue [for 8 months]. Such does not rise to the level of undue prejudice here."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Analytical Technologies, LLC v. Little Caesar Enterprises, Inc. 2-24-cv-00090 (EDTX)	Jul. 25, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "Given that the PTAB is expected to issue its final written decision more than a year before this case goes to trial, and given that Defendant has stipulated to be bound by [another petitioner's] arguments in that IPR, it is likely that the PTAB's decision will simply the issues in this case. . . . Defendant filed its IPR petition just thirty-eight days after Plaintiff filed suit. The parties had not yet invested resources into the discovery process, nor had the Court yet invested resources into claim construction. . . . While Plaintiff is correct that the PTAB's final written decision might not issue until April 2026. Such does not rise to the level of undue prejudice here."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Headwater Research LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00641 (EDTX)	Jul. 07, 2025	

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd. v. Canadian Solar, Inc. 2-24-cv-00210 (EDTX)	Jul. 01, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "Given that the PTAB is expected to issue its final written decisions before this case goes to trial, it is possible if not likely that its decision will simply the issues in this case. . . . At the time that Defendant filed this Motion, 'the parties had yet to notice or take a single deposition and discovery remained at a relatively early stage.' Also, the Court has not yet begun the claim construction process, and such hearing is not scheduled until later this summer. . . . Plaintiff primarily argues that it would be unduly prejudiced because Plaintiff and Defendant are competitors in the solar-energy market. However, Plaintiff does not practice the patent in suit, does not seek damages based on lost sales or profits, and has not moved for a preliminary injunction in this case. These facts undercut Plaintiff's argument of undue prejudice."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	ElectraLED, Inc. v. Astera LED Technology GmbH 2-24-cv-00512 (EDTX)	Jun. 23, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	RavenWhite Licensing LLC v. The Home Depot, Inc. et al 2-24-cv-00688 (EDTX)	Jun. 18, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the lack of undue prejudice, the stage of the case, and potential simplification of the issues favored a stay. "Where, as here, a patentee seeks exclusively monetary damages, as opposed to a preliminary injunction or other relief, 'mere delay in collecting those damages does not constitute undue prejudice.' Further, final written decisions for the IPRs are expected before the scheduled trial . . . . The instant Motion was filed on March 21, 2025. At that point, a trial date had been set; a Discovery Order had been entered; and, as Plaintiff asserts, infringement contentions had been served. However, Defendants are correct in asserting that this case is still in its early stages . . . . [T]he Board has instituted a trial covering all asserted claims."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Harbor Island Dynamic, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-24-cv-00140 (EDTX)	May. 19, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the stage of the case and potential simplification of the issues favored a stay. "The instant Motion was filed on April 11, 2025. At that point, a trial date had been set; a Discovery Order had been entered; and, as Plaintiff asserts, many pre-trial actions had been undertaken. However, Defendants are correct in asserting that large parts of discovery and many other important deadlines were still left at that point. Furthermore, Defendants had earlier filed a motion to stay on October 18, 2024. . . . [T]he Board has instituted a trial covering all asserted claims. Accordingly, the simplification factor weighs in favor of a stay."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	SK nexilis Co., Ltd. v. Solus Advanced Materials Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00539 (EDTX)	May. 13, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Vasu Holdings, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-24-cv-00034 (EDTX)	May. 09, 2025	

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Lionra Technologies Ltd. v. Cisco Systems, Inc. 2-24-cv-00097 (EDTX)	Apr. 29, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

The court denied defendant's renewed motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the potential for prejudice to plaintiff disfavored a stay. "[T]he PTAB's final written decision, which could be subject to further appeals, is not due until a date more than five months after the jury trial is set to begin. . . . The Court is not persuaded by Defendant's arguments regarding the Unified Patent Court's decision regarding the '471 Patent's European counterpart. The Unified Patent Court considered a different patent, under a different standard, and based on different facts. The Court is not bound by the Unified Patent Court's decision. Therefore, this unrelated foreign proceeding does not weigh upon whether this Court should stay these proceedings. . . . Additionally, the Court is unconvinced by Defendant's argument that Plaintiff will not suffer prejudice because it is a non-practicing entity. Defendant fundamentally asks the Court to create two classes of plaintiffs—non-practicing entities and practicing entities—and to find that only practicing entities can suffer prejudice because of a stay. The Court declines to do so."

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied defendant's renewed motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the lack of simplification of the issues slightly disfavored a stay. "While the Court acknowledges there is some possibility that resolution of the IPR could simplify the issues of this case, that is far from a certainty. It is unknown whether the PTAB will find all or even some of the asserted claims unpatentable. The only scenario in which the IPR disposes of the entire case is if the PTAB invalidates all claims of the '471 Patent and the Federal Circuit affirms the PTAB's decision on appeal. Further, the IPR only covers a portion of Defendant's invalidity arguments. The PTAB's decision will address only a single theory, obviousness under § 103, concerning four prior art references. The IPR will not address Defendant's argument that the '471 Patent is invalid under §§ 101 and/or 112."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Croga Innovations Ltd. v. Cisco Systems, Inc. 2-24-cv-00065 (EDTX)	Apr. 15, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

The court denied defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the potential for undue prejudice disfavored a stay. "[Plaintiff] maintains that it has an interest in the timely enforcement of its patent rights despite being a non-practicing entity. . . . 'All parties have an interest in the timely vindication of their patent rights, regardless of their practicing status.' Although this interest 'is not sufficient, standing alone, to defeat a motion to stay,' the final written decision for the IPR of the '601 Patent could issue four months after the scheduled trial. Additionally, the court notes that the EPR of the '780 Patent could take tens of months to conclude as the Office has only issued a non-final office action on April 1, 2025."

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court denied defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and concluded that the stage of the case disfavored a stay. "'*Usually*, the Court evaluates the stage of the case as of the time the motion was filed.' However, when a movant receives the benefit of post-motion facts in support of its motion to stay, the non-moving party should receive the same under this factor. Accordingly, the stage of the case should be evaluated as of . . . when the Office initiated EPR of the '780 Patent. At that point, the parties had already invested a substantial amount of work and financial resources in the case. The Court has set this case—which began over a year ago—for trial. Discovery is well underway as the deadline to substantially complete document production and exchange privilege logs has passed, the parties have exchanged and reviewed thousands of documents, including source code, and the Court has entered the Discovery Order. Additionally, the parties have filed claim construction briefs."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Procomm International Pte. Ltd. v. Verizon Communications, Inc. et al 2-24-cv-00009 (EDTX)	Apr. 06, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	WellcomeMat, LLC v. Aylo Holdings Sarl et al 2-23-cv-00483 (EDTX)	Feb. 24, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Cellspin Soft, Inc. v. ByteDance Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00496 (EDTX)	Jan. 27, 2025	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that that the stage of the case and potential simplification of the issues favored a stay. "Defendants are correct in asserting that large parts of discovery and many other important deadlines were still left at that point. . . . Defendants contend that the IPR proceedings currently pending against Cobblestone's asserted patents will greatly simplify the issues for this Court. To demonstrate this, Defendants need to show that every asserted claim has a reasonable likelihood of being invalidated by the Board for the Court to grant the Motion. Here, the Board has instituted a trial covering all asserted claims."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Mullen Industries LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-24-cv-00049 (EDTX)	Jan. 23, 2025	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Harbor Island Dynamic, LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-24-cv-00140 (EDTX)	Dec. 19, 2024	

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Cobblestone Wireless, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc. 2-23-cv-00454 (EDTX)	Dec. 09, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and determined that the stage of the case and potential simplification of the issues favored a stay. "The instant Motion was filed on June 25, 2024. At that point, a trial date had been set and a Discovery Order had been entered. However, Defendants are correct in asserting that large parts of discovery and many other important deadlines were still left at that point. . . . [T]he Board has instituted a trial covering all asserted claims. Accordingly, the simplification factor weighs in favor of a stay."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Headwater Research LLC v. T-Mobile US, Inc. et al 2-23-cv-00379 (EDTX)	Nov. 14, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied as premature defendants' motion to stay pending institution of *inter partes* review. "Defendants contend that the IPR proceedings currently pending against [Plaintiff's] asserted patents will greatly simplify the issues for this Court. However, the Board has not yet rendered any institution decisions on six of the seven petitions covering three of the four asserted patents. The 'universal practice' in this District, as well as the practice of most district courts, is to deny a motion for stay when the Board has not yet acted on a petition for IPR."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Headwater Research LLC v. Verizon Communications Inc. et al 2-23-cv-00352 (EDTX)	Nov. 08, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied as premature defendant's motion to stay pending institution of *inter partes* review. "[Defendant] contends that the IPR proceedings currently pending against [Plaintiff's] asserted patents will greatly simplify the issues for this Court. However, the Board has not yet rendered any institution decisions on six of the seven petitions covering three of the four asserted patents. The 'universal practice' in this District, as well as the practice of most district courts, is to deny a motion for stay when the Board has not yet acted on a petition for IPR. The reasoning behind this is that unless the Board indicates there is a serious chance it will invalidate all the asserted claims, the Court will not needlessly wait to rule on the remaining asserted claims."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Lionra Technologies Limited v. Fortinet, Inc. 2-22-cv-00322 (EDTX)	Sep. 09, 2024	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Intercurrency Software LLC v. Binance Holdings, Ltd. 2-23-cv-00370 (EDTX)	Aug. 29, 2024	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Slyde Analytics LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00083 (EDTX)	Jul. 31, 2024	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Foras Technologies Limited v. Volkswagen AG et al 2-23-cv-00314 (EDTX)	Jul. 25, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential simplification of the issues and stage of the case favored a stay. "IPR has been instituted on the asserted claims of the '958 patent. In addition, all the claims of the '958 patent have been rejected in the pending EPR. . . . Fact discovery has just begun, and the parties have taken no depositions and served no interrogatories. The Court has not yet conducted the Markman hearing, which is set for [seven months from now]. The bulk of the work in this case has yet to take place."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Broadphone LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00001 (EDTX)	Jul. 24, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted plaintiff's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "IPRs have been instituted on all claims for all the asserted patents for multiple grounds. And considering the *Soterra* stipulations in this case, even if some of the IPRs are ultimately denied, the resulting estoppel would simplify the case. . . . A significant amount of discovery remains, the claim construction hearing has not occurred, and trial is currently set for [7 months from now]. Further, the Court does not find that Samsung filed the IPR at such a late stage in the case that it would weigh against a stay. . . . [D]elay in vindication of patent rights, while inherently prejudicial to any plaintiff, is not so unduly prejudicial in the instant case to warrant denying a stay."

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Resonant Systems, Inc. v. Sony Group Corporation (Japan) et al 2-22-cv-00424 (EDTX)	Jul. 09, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court denied defendants' motion to stay pending institution of *inter partes* review and found that the lack of simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and potential for prejudice disfavored a stay. "None of [Defendants'] IPRs have been instituted, and there is no institution decision for the '337 patent IPR. . . . Defendants' attempt to rely on non-party Samsung's IPRs is misguided. The fact that the claims of the '337 patent and the '081 patent may share some common language does not guarantee that the PTAB will institute IPR on the '337 patent. . . . Defendants waited 10 months after service of this lawsuit to file its IPRs. . . . Granting a stay in this case could delay its resolution by more than two years, as the PTAB decision is not due until over 8 months after jury trial is set to begin. Such a delay would prejudice Plaintiff's ability to vindicate its patent rights."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	STA Group LLC v. Motorola Solutions, Inc. 2-23-cv-00030 (EDTX)	Jul. 04, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential simplification of the issues and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "IPRs have been instituted on all asserted claims. Further, the Court finds that [Defendant] has demonstrated that a stay would result in significant simplification of issues. Additionally . . . [Defendant] points to institution on multiple grounds, weighing in favor of a finding that a likelihood of some or all of the claims will be found invalid. . . . [D]elay in vindication of patent rights, while inherently prejudicial to any plaintiff, is not so unduly prejudicial in the instant case to warrant denying a stay. . . . Plaintiff's reliance on [its witness's] age being 'over 70 years-old' as weighing against stay is not persuasive. Absent the single specific assertion regarding [the witness], Plaintiff's broad assertions regarding degradation of witness testimony does not weigh against a stay in this case."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	FlatFrog Laboratories AB v. Chemtronics Co., Ltd. 2-23-cv-00306 (EDTX)	Jun. 14, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**

The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential for undue prejudice disfavored a stay. "The parties concede that they are competitors, Defendant's argument on this point is only that their competition does not result in sufficient undue prejudice to weigh heavily on this factor. The Court does not find this argument availing. While Plaintiff has licensed its patents to other parties, Defendant has not shown that such a practice diminishes the impact on the competition between the parties. In contrast, Plaintiff has identified a specific instance of competition that has a significant impact on Plaintiff's business which is, pending a finding of infringement, directly impacted by the protections provided by the asserted patents."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	STA Group LLC v. Motorola Solutions, Inc. 2-22-cv-00381 (EDTX)	Jun. 05, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending inter partes review and found that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "IPRs have been instituted on all asserted claims. . . . [Defendant] points to institution on multiple grounds, weighing in favor of a finding that a likelihood of some or all of the claims will be found invalid. . . . The Court does not find that a four-day delay between the last institution decision and the filing of the current Motion weighs against granting a stay. In light of several amendments to infringement contentions, the Court finds that the delay in filing IPRs only slightly weighs against stay, as the delay was approximately two months after the amended contentions. . . . Plaintiff's reliance on [a potential witness's] age being 'over 70 years-old' as weighing against stay is not persuasive. Absent the single specific assertion regarding [the witness], Plaintiff's broad assertions regarding degradation of witness testimony does not weigh against a stay in this case."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Headwater Research LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-22-cv-00422 (EDTX)	May. 27, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the lack of simplification of the issues disfavored a stay. "[T]he PTAB decided to deny institution on three of the asserted patents. As such, even an ultimate finding in favor of [Defendant] invalidating all claims of the other patents would leave material disputes for the Court to decide."

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	General Access Solutions, Ltd. v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless et al 2-22-cv-00394 (EDTX)	May. 22, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential for undue prejudice and stage of the case disfavored a stay. "Granting a stay in this case could delay its resolution by more than two years, as the PTAB decision is not due until over six months after jury trial is set to begin. Such a delay would prejudice Plaintiff's ability to vindicate its patent rights. . . . At the time the Motion to Stay was filed, this case had been pending for over a year and three months and the Court had already conducted a Claim Construction hearing. Jury selection was a mere five months away. By the time the Motion was fully briefed, the parties had exchanged thousands of documents, taken numerous depositions, and served opening expert reports. As Plaintiff notes, the deadline for the PTAB's final written decision is six months after trial is set to begin in this case."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Force MOS Technology Co., Ltd. v. ASUSTeK Computer, Inc. 2-22-cv-00460 (EDTX)	Apr. 11, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending institution of *inter partes* review and found that the potential for prejudice, stage of the case, and lack of simplification of the issues disfavored a stay. "'[T]he failure to seek an injunction does not amount to an admission by plaintiff that it will not be prejudiced by a stay.' . . . [T]he original complaint had been filed (1) over a year before Defendant filed the Motion and (2) nearly a year before Petitioner filed the IPR petitions. Critically, Defendant received Plaintiff's infringement contentions on May 16, 2023. Defendant thus had notice of Plaintiff's positions with respect to the scope of the claims for over five months before the IPR petitions were filed. . . . [W]hen a party files such a premature motion to stay, this Court will deny the motion without prejudice to refile the same following the PTAB's institution decision regarding the last of the patents-in-suit to be acted upon by the PTAB. However, here, the Court finds that the Motion should be denied *with* prejudice given that only two of the three Asserted Patents have been challenged at the PTAB."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Headwater Research LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-23-cv-00103 (EDTX)	Apr. 04, 2024	
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Polaris PowerLED Technologies, LLC v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. f/k/a Samsung Telecommunications America LLC et al 2-22-cv-00469 (EDTX)	Mar. 15, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied defendant's motion to sever one count of plaintiff's patent infringement suit and stay it pending *inter partes* review and found that the lack of simplification of the issues and the potential for undue prejudice disfavored a stay. "Given that the PTAB has indicated a likelihood of success only for asserted claims 1, 2, and 7—not asserted claims 3 and 5—and especially in light of the PTAB's skepticism regarding Ground 4, it seems possible, and in fact likely, that claim 5 (if not other asserted claims) will survive the IPR proceedings. . . . Doing as [Defendant] requests would ensure that if any claims survived the IPR proceeding . . . the Court and the parties would have to undertake duplicative actions, including redundant damages and technical discovery on overlapping accused products, two separate claim construction hearings, two pre-trial conferences, and two trials. Such a multiplication of this proceeding would unnecessarily drive up the costs and efforts required to adjudicate [Plaintiff's] patent rights, resulting in undue prejudice to [Plaintiff]."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Netlist, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-22-cv-00293 (EDTX)	Mar. 11, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage**
Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court denied defendant's renewed motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the lack of undue prejudice and stage of the case disfavored a stay. "A delay in the proceedings would be prejudicial to [Plaintiff] as a competitor to [Defendant], and any stay could be further extended if either party appeals the PTAB's findings to the Federal Circuit. Further, the Court is convinced that timely resolution of [Plaintiff's] patent claims are warranted given that the next generation DIMMs will soon make the allegedly infringing accused DIMMs obsolete. The fact that [Plaintiff] is seeking solely monetary damages does not mean that [Plaintiff] cannot be prejudiced by a significant delay of an imminent trial date. . . . The parties have engaged in substantial discovery, claim construction, and have served expert reports. Further, the trial is only a few months away."

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Resonant Systems, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al 2-22-cv-00423 (EDTX)	Mar. 08, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the potential simplification of the issues favored a stay. "If the PTAB were to find some or all of the claims under review to be valid, Defendants would be estopped from asserting invalidity defenses on any grounds they raised or reasonably could have raised during inter partes review. Further, the cancellation of some or all of the claims could result in simplification of issues in this case. This Court declines [Plaintiff's] invitation to hold that the PTAB must expressly comment that the grounds for institution are particularly 'strong' as to every claim to find that there is a likelihood of issue simplification. . . . To adopt this posture would essentially allow the PTAB to decide the stay issue by making or withholding early evaluating comments."

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Stage of Litigation**

The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending *inter partes* review and found that the stage of the case favored a stay. "[T]his case has not yet had a Markman hearing. At the time of the filing of the present Motion, the parties had only conducted 8 two depositions. [Defendant] alleges (and [Plaintiff] does not dispute) that the parties still have the bulk of depositions ahead of them, including depositions in Korea. . . . While [Defendant] could have acted sooner in initially filing its petitions for *inter partes* review, it filed its Motion to Stay with reasonable dispatch and at an early stage of the case[.]"

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Mojo Mobility Inc v. Samsung Electronics Co., LTD, et al 2-22-cv-00398 (EDTX)	Feb. 26, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending *inter partes* review of fewer than all of the patents in suit. "At best, only a single patent of the six at issue before the Court could be subject to an IPR. Even if all asserted claims of that patent were found invalid, the Court would still be left to conduct a trial as to the remaining patents. Thus, there is very limited simplification to be gained by a stay in this case. With minimal simplification, the Court finds there is no grounds to grant this motion.

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Netlist, Inc. v. Micron Technology, Inc. et al 2-22-cv-00203 (EDTX)	Feb. 10, 2024	

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Reduction of Litigation Burden**

Stay of Proceedings
└ Factors Considered
└ **Simplification of Issues**

District Court Procedural Issues
└ Motion Practice in General
└ **Reconsideration**

The court *sua sponte* reconsidered an earlier order declining to stay the case pending *inter partes* review and instead instituted a stay. "This case began with six asserted patents.1 All of these patents have been instituted for review by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB). Four of these six patents have been invalidated by the PTAB. These decisions are being appealed. The remaining two patents . . . have been instituted for review by the PTAB but no decision has been issued to date. However, it is expected that the decisions from the PTAB will issue by or before [two months from now]. To put this particular case to trial before a jury in this Court before the PTAB issues its decision on the two remaining patents risks an inefficient consumption of limited judicial resources that makes imposing a targeted stay, until that ruling is received, advisable."

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Netlist, Inc. v. Micron Technology, Inc. et al 2-22-cv-00203 (EDTX)	Jan. 31, 2024	

Perceptive Exhibit 2037
IPR2025-01576