

U.S. District Courts Stay

46 Results

Case Numbers: From Stay Cases Postures of Motion: Stipulated/Agreed, Sua Sponte, Motion by a Party Types of Document: 43 Types of Document Judges: Jennifer L. Hall

	Type of Document	Result of ...	Case	Date ▼	Appeal Status		
	Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Denied	Ingenus Pharmaceuticals, LLC v. Hetero USA, Inc. et al 1-24-cv-01025 (DDE)	Oct. 21, 2025			
	Motion to Stay -- Other	Denied	Washington v. Air Water Inc. et al 1-24-cv-00715 (DDE)	Aug. 21, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Granted	UCB, Inc. et al v. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA Inc. 1-25-cv-00382 (DDE)	Aug. 18, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al v. Netlist, Inc 1-23-cv-01122 (DDE)	Aug. 01, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Granted	CogniPower LLC v. Fantasia Trading LLC d/b/a Anker Direct 1-19-cv-02293 (DDE)	Jul. 16, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	Credo Semiconductor Inc. et al v. Molex, LLC 1-25-cv-00316 (DDE)	Apr. 23, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	Klein Tools, Inc. v. Milwaukee Electric Tool Corporation 1-25-cv-00143 (DDE)	Mar. 28, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Dispositive Motion	Granted	Robocast, Inc. v. YouTube, LLC et al 1-22-cv-00304 (DDE)	Feb. 20, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Bankruptcy	Granted	Vitaworks IP, LLC et al v. Glanbia Nutritionals (NA), Inc. 1-21-cv-00327 (DDE)	Jan. 14, 2025			
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Sandvik Mining and Construction USA LLC et al v. CMS Cepercor Limited 1-24-cv-00481 (DDE)	Oct. 10, 2024			
	Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Aerin Medical Inc. et al v. Neurent Medical Inc. et al 1-23-cv-00756 (DDE)	Aug. 08, 2024			

Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Reduction of Litigation Burden Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Simplification of Issues Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Stage of Litigation	Granted	Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc. v. ResMed Inc. 1-22-cv-00794 (DDE)	Jun. 21, 2024	PDF
		The court granted defendant's motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review. "The instituted IPR proceedings have the potential to substantially simplify the issues to be tried; a stay will also serve judicial economy because a majority of the pending pre-trial motions involve the patent at issue in the IPR. I have given serious consideration and weight to both the fact that the district judge previously assigned to this case scheduled a trial to begin . . . [a]pproximately two months from now[] and the fact that the parties and Court have already spent significant time on this case, but those facts must be balanced against other factors, including that the most resource-intensive phases of the case still lie ahead, and the PTAB's decision could reduce the current burden on the Court and greatly simplify the issues for trial. Although the case involves other patents not subject to the IPR, the record reflects that those patents account for less than 10% of the total damages claim, and neither side seriously contends that the Court should proceed with a trial on only the non-instituted patents."		
Motion to Stay Pending Dispositive Motion	Granted	Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma Corporation v. Cipla USA, Inc. et al 1-23-cv-00759 (DDE)	Jun. 18, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay -- Other	Denied	Nippon Shinyaku., Ltd. v. Sarepta Therapeutics, Inc. 1-21-cv-01015 (DDE)	Apr. 18, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay -- Other	Denied as moot	Nippon Shinyaku., Ltd. v. Sarepta Therapeutics, Inc. 1-21-cv-01015 (DDE)	Apr. 16, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	Medtronic, Inc. et al v. Axonics, Inc. f/k/a Axonics Modulation Technologies, Inc. 1-24-cv-00264 (DDE)	Apr. 05, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Apple Inc. v. Masimo Corporation et al 1-22-cv-01377 (DDE)	Mar. 20, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Diogenes Limited et al v. DraftKings Inc. 1-21-cv-01695 (DDE)	Mar. 20, 2024	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Colt International Clothing, Inc. d/b/a Colt LED v. Quasar Science, LLC et al 1-22-cv-00213 (DDE)	Mar. 12, 2024	PDF

— Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review 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	Granted	Starz Entertainment, LLC v. VL Collective IP, LLC et al 1-21-cv-01448 (DDE)	Jan. 18, 2024	PDF
The court granted the declaratory judgment plaintiff's motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review and found that the potential simplification of the issues, stage of the case, and lack of undue prejudice favored a stay. "[E]very single asserted claim in all three asserted patents has either been determined to be invalid by the PTAB and/or is the subject of an instituted IPR. In addition, although [Plaintiff] contends that it is not a party to the pending IPRs, [Plaintiff] has agreed (as a condition of the stay) to be estopped from challenging the validity of any surviving claims based on grounds and references that were raised and decided in the IPRs. The Court additionally concludes that a stay will not unduly prejudice [Defendant], which does not compete with [Plaintiff]. And, although trial is currently scheduled to begin on March 11, 2024, the Court cannot say that pretrial proceedings are complete, as additional damages discovery and claim construction proceedings may still be necessary (e.g., additional expert reports on damages that take into account the PTAB's invalidation of many of the asserted claims, as well as additional claim construction proceedings to assess the impact of [Defendant's] IPR positions)."				
Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Granted	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al v. Netlist, Inc. 1-21-cv-01453 (DDE)	Dec. 01, 2023	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	Rotolight Limited v. Videndum PLC et al 1-22-cv-00928 (DDE)	Oct. 11, 2023	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Denied in part granted in part	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al v. Netlist, Inc. 1-21-cv-01453 (DDE)	Oct. 10, 2023	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied in part granted in part	Cargill, Incorporated et al v. Vantage Specialty Chemicals, Inc. 1-22-cv-00979 (DDE)	Oct. 05, 2023	PDF
Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Recommended denial	Applied Biokinetics LLC v. KT Health, LLC 1-22-cv-00638 (DDE)	Aug. 31, 2023	PDF

Motion to Stay -- Other	Recommen ded denial	Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al v. Netlist, Inc. 1-21-cv-01453 (DDE)	Aug. 18, 2023		
District Court Procedural Issues Severing, Consolidating & Relating Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Harm Without Stay Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Interests of Justice (Stay)		The magistrate judge recommended denying the retailers' motion to sever and stay the patentee defendant's claims against them and rejected the retailers' claims of prejudice and fairness. "[The retailers] point only to the fact that they are having to defend against [the patentee's] infringement counterclaims. But that is not prejudice; it is a consequence of the Patent Act, which makes using a patented invention an act of infringement. And, again, the record is not precise about the extent to which the [retailers] have agreed or will agree to be bound by the outcome of the [patentees claims against the manufacturer]. It is not unfair or prejudicial to require the [retailers] to defend this case."			
Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Recommen ded denial	Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company Limited v. Daedalus Prime LLC et al 1-22-cv-01647 (DDE)	Jul. 05, 2023		
Motion to Stay Pending Dispositive Motion	Denied	Apple Inc. v. Masimo Corporation et al 1-22-cv-01377 (DDE)	May. 05, 2023		
Motion to Stay Pending Dispositive Motion	Denied	Bataan Licensing LLC v. DentalEZ, Inc. 1-22-cv-00238 (DDE)	Aug. 05, 2022		
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	RideShare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc. 1-20-cv-01629 (DDE)	Apr. 18, 2022		
Motion to Stay -- Other	Granted	Covis Pharma GmbH et al v. Eugia Pharma Specialties Ltd. et al 1-21-cv-00003 (DDE)	Apr. 14, 2022		
Motion to Stay Pending Dispositive Motion	Denied as moot	Nanexa AB v. VitriVax, Inc. 1-21-cv-00764 (DDE)	Mar. 17, 2022		
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied in part granted in part	Ravgen, Inc. v. Illumina, Inc. et al. 1-20-cv-01644 (DDE)	Mar. 01, 2022		
Stay of Proceedings Factors Considered Simplification of Issues District Court Procedural Issues Stay of Proceedings Conditions of Stay		The court granted defendants' motions to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review on the condition that non-petitioning defendants stipulate to IPR estoppel. "Defendants' Motions to Stay are granted subject to non-petitioner Defendants filing within 7 days a stipulation of estoppel consistent with the hearing today."			

— Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	RideShare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc. 1-20-cv-01629 (DDE)	Dec. 17, 2021	☰ PDF
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 stay pending its five petitions for <i>inter partes</i> review because the lack of potential simplification of issues and undue prejudice to plaintiff weighed against a stay. "The PTAB might choose to institute review on all of the asserted patents, some of them, or none of them. If it institutes on all or some of them, the case might be simplified. If it institutes review on none of them, this case will not be materially simplified. It is too speculative at this time to conclude that a stay will -- or even is likely to -- simplify the issues for trial. . . . Even if we picked back up on the day that the institution decisions come out in April, we are losing five months and I think everybody on the line here today agrees that there would not be time to complete discovery and motions practice and maintain the current trial date. And, while the mere potential for delay is insufficient to establish undue prejudice,⁹ here a stay would almost certainly cause delay, and the prejudice accompanying that delay is undue because, as I said earlier, it's only speculative that the issues would be simplified. I also cannot dismiss the possibility that a delay might prevent Plaintiff from getting their product onto the market."		
— Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied without prejudice	RideShare Displays, Inc. v. Lyft, Inc. 1-20-cv-01629 (DDE)	Dec. 09, 2021	☰ PDF
Stay of Proceedings ↳ Factors Considered ↳ Simplification of Issues		The court denied without prejudice defendant's motion to stay pending its five petitions for <i>inter partes</i> review. "[T]he parties will meet & confer and propose a new date for the <i>Markman</i> hearing in [six months] and [defendant] may refile a motion to stay after the PTAB rules on institution."		
— Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	DivX, LLC v. LG Electronics, Inc. et al 1-20-cv-01202 (DDE)	Jun. 03, 2021	☰ PDF
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 its own patent infringement action pending an ITC investigation involving one of the two patents-in-suit. "This case is in its infancy and the Court has not yet entered a scheduling order. A related case and claims against another defendant in this case have been stayed. The ITC case is set for trial next month. . . . [T]his action and the pending ITC case have sufficient overlapping factual and legal issues such that there is a potential for significant simplification of this litigation, notwithstanding that one of the two patents-in-suit (which share a common disclosure) is not at issue in the ITC case. . . . While granting a stay might postpone the resolution of [defendant's] pending motions before this Court (including its pending Section 101 motion), the Court does not find such delay to be unduly prejudicial, particularly since the issue of the validity of the [patent] is before the ITC[.]"		
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	3Shape A/S v. Align Technology, Inc. 1-18-cv-00886 (DDE)	Feb. 26, 2021	☰ PDF

Motion to Stay Discovery	Denied	Evertz Microsystems Ltd. v. Lawo Inc. et al 1-19-cv-00302 (DDE)	Feb. 23, 2021	 
Motion to Stay Pending Arbitration/Mediation	Denied	VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation 1-18-cv-00966 (DDE)	Jan. 13, 2021	 
 Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of Related Action	Denied	VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation 1-18-cv-00966 (DDE)	Jan. 13, 2021	 
- Stay of Proceedings - Factors Considered Simplification of Issues - Stay of Proceedings - Factors Considered Stage of Litigation		The court denied defendant's motion to stay plaintiff's patent infringement action in order to allow defendant to pursue a claim at mediation and in Chancery Court that defendant obtained a license to plaintiff's patents because the lack of potential simplification of issues and late stage of the case weighed against a stay. "[A] stay to allow concurrent litigation over a license would not simplify the issues in the same way as, for example, a stay pending an IPR. Unlike an IPR proceeding where the Court benefits from statutory estoppel, the views of the PTAB, and a supplemented intrinsic record, here efficiencies would be realized only if [defendant] succeeds on the merits of its license argument. . . . [I]mportantly, [defendant] has yet to file a case in Chancery Court. . . . Expert discovery closes [next month], and dispositive motions are due a month later."		
 Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Granted	Wildcat Licensing WI LLC v. Bayerische Motoren Werke AG et al 1-19-cv-00834 (DDE)	Nov. 25, 2020	 
- Stay of Proceedings - Factors Considered Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage - District Court Procedural Issues - Stay of Proceedings Conditions of Stay		The court granted defendants' motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review and rejected plaintiff's requests to impose conditions on the stay including imposing estoppel under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e) on non-petitioning defendants and requiring certain discovery during the stay. "[F]our sets of defendants in these cases are petitioners in the IPRs and will be estopped under 35 U.S.C. § 315(e) from raising arguments that were raised or reasonably could have raised during the IPRs. The remaining, non-petitioner defendants have agreed 'to a limited IPR estoppel as to the specific grounds that were raised in the IPRs and addressed in a final, non-appealable judgment (but not all other grounds that reasonably could have been raised in the IPRs)'. . . The PTAB has a discovery process of which [plaintiff] may avail itself should it seek evidence to use in that forum. . . . The Court will not require Defendants to serve their responsive claim construction brief at this time; Plaintiff is aware of Defendants' claim construction positions from the parties' [joint] Claim Construction Chart."		
Motion to Stay -- Other	Denied	VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation 1-18-cv-00966 (DDE)	Nov. 24, 2020	 
Motion to Stay -- Other	Granted	CoolTVNetwork.com, Inc. v. Blackboard, Inc. 1-19-cv-00291 (DDE)	Nov. 19, 2020	 
Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	DivX, LLC v. TCL Corporation et al 1-20-cv-01203 (DDE)	Nov. 19, 2020	 

Motion to Stay Pending Investigation by ITC	Granted	DivX, LLC v. LG Electronics, Inc. et al 1-20-cv-01202 (DDE)	Nov. 19, 2020	 
Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied as moot	Align Technology, Inc. v. 3Shape A/S et al 1-17-cv-01648 (DDE)	Feb. 03, 2020	 