

Exhibit 2007

Germ Dome Industries LLC

PGR2026-00030

Hyundai Motor America Inc. v.

Germ Dome Industries LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL****JS-6**

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

Present: **HONORABLE FRED W. SLAUGHTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**Rolls Royce Paschal
Deputy ClerkN/A
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION
TO STAY CASE PENDING POST-GRANT REVIEW [34]****I. Introduction and Background**

In this case, Plaintiff Germ Dome Industries (“Germ Dome”) alleges Defendant Hyundai Motor America (“Hyundai”) infringes Germ Dome’s United States Patent No. 12,296,061 (the “Patent”), titled “SYSTEM AND APPARATUS FOR SANITIZING A DOOR OPENING DEVICE OR OTHER POINT OF CONTACT,” by “offer[ing] a vehicle called the Hyundai Sante Fe, which includes a device for sanitizing an object.” (Dkt. 1 (Complaint, “Compl.”) ¶¶ 6, 8, 10, 15, Ex. A.) The court previously denied Hyundai’s Motion to Dismiss, in which Hyundai argued the Patent is invalid because it is directed to patent-ineligible subject matter. (Dkt. 32.) The court has issued a Scheduling Order, with trial set for June 2027, a last date to hear motions in March 2027, and a non-expert discovery cutoff in November 2026. (Dkt. 30.) “Though not ordered by the Court, the parties have agreed to make certain patent-specific disclosures as set forth in their Joint Rule 26(f) Report. Pursuant to this agreement, Germ Dome served its Infringement Contentions on March 12, 2026. Hyundai’s Invalidity Contentions are due April 26, 2026.” (Dkt. 37 at 1-2.)

On February 13, 2026, Hyundai filed a Petition for Post-Grant Review (“PGR”) of all of the Patent’s claims with the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (“PTO”) “on multiple grounds, including anticipation and obviousness.” (See Dkt. 29 (Joint 26(f) Report) at 1; Dkt. 34 at 4-5; Dkt. 34-3.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

“[A] person who is not the owner of a patent may file with the Office a petition to institute a post-grant review of the patent. 35 U.S.C. § 321(a). “A petitioner in a post-grant review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent on any ground that could be raised under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 282(b) (relating to invalidity of the patent or any claim).” *Id.* § 321(b). A PGR may be instituted if “the information presented in the petition . . . if such information is not rebutted, would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable,” or “by a showing that the petition raises a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or patent applications.” *Id.* § 324(a)-(b). The PTO must decide whether to institute a PGR within “3 months after . . . receiving a preliminary response to the petition under section 323” or “if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed.” In this case, that date is August 26, 2026. (Dkt. 34-1 at 5-6; Dkt. 37 at 3.) If a PGR proceeding is instituted, a decision usually issues within a year after institution. (Dkt. 34-1 at 6; Dkt. 37 at 1.)

Before the court is Hyundai’s Motion to Stay Case Pending Post-Grant Review. (Dkt. 34 (“Motion” or “Mot.”).) Germ Dome opposes the Motion. (Dkt. 37 (“Opp.”).) Specifically, “Germ Dome submits that Hyundai’s request for a stay is premature. If the USPTO institutes Hyundai’s PGR, Germ Dome will not oppose a stay. For now, however, Germ Dome requests that the Court allow this case to continue until the USPTO renders an institution decision in August 2026.” (*Id.* at 6.) Hyundai filed a reply in support of the Motion. (Dkt. 40.) The court finds this matter appropriate for resolution without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b) (“By rule or order, the court may provide for submitting and determining motions on briefs, without oral hearings.”); C.D. Cal. L.R. 7-15 (authorizing courts to “dispense with oral argument on any motion except where an oral hearing is required by statute”). Accordingly, the **hearing** set for **April 30, 2026**, (*see* Dkt. 39), is **VACATED** and **OFF CALENDAR**.

II. Legal Standard and Analysis

“Courts have inherent power to manage their dockets and stay proceedings, including the authority to order a stay pending conclusion of a PTO reexamination.” *Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg*, 849 F.2d 1422, 1426-27 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (internal citations omitted). Although courts are not required to stay judicial proceedings pending re-examination of a patent, “there is a liberal policy in favor of granting motions to stay proceedings pending the outcome of re-examination,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

especially in cases that are still in the initial stages of litigation and where there has been little or no discovery.” *Universal Elecs., Inc. v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d 1028, 1031 (C.D. Cal. 2013). (citation modified) (collecting cases). “Three significant factors in deciding whether to stay an action are: (1) whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the case; and (3) whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the nonmoving party.” *Id.* at 1030-31 (internal quotation omitted). “The inquiry is not limited to these three factors. Rather, the totality of the circumstances governs.” *Id.* at 1031 (internal quotation omitted). “While the case law states several general considerations that are helpful in determining whether to order a stay, ultimately the Court must decide stay requests on a case-by-case basis.” *PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d 1022, 1025 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (internal quotation omitted).

A. Stage of the Proceedings

“The first factor is the stage of the proceedings, including whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set” and whether the court has “held a *Markman* hearing and issued its claim construction ruling.” *Universal Elecs.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1031. “Courts applying this factor often ask whether there is more work ahead of the parties and the Court than behind.” *Nike, Inc. v. Skechers U.S.A., Inc.*, 2025 WL 439935, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2025).

The court finds this factor favors a stay in this case. Discovery has only just begun, and much costly work remains ahead. *See, e.g., PersonalWeb Techs.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d at 1027 (“In this case, too, already the parties have undertaken significant work, but the Court has not set a trial date and several costly stages of discovery remain.”); *Nichia Corp. v. Vizio, Inc.*, 2018 WL 2448098, at *2 (C.D. Cal. May 21, 2018) (“[E]ven considering the parties’ Texas efforts, a *Markman* hearing, expert discovery, and trial preparation all lay ahead. This factor favors a stay.”). The court has only recently set a trial date, and that trial date is over a year away. (*See* Scheduling Order; Rule 26(f) Report.) Although the court has expended some resources in deciding the motion to dismiss, that was a much lower expenditure than necessary for a *Markman* hearing and claim construction ruling, and significant additional work remains ahead.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

See Universal Elecs., 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1031 (finding first factor weighed against a stay when the court had already “spent substantial effort construing the claims,” and “[t]he Court’s expenditure of resources is an important factor in evaluating the stage of the proceedings”). “In sum, while the case has been pending for [5] months, the litigation is at a relatively early stage,” *Wonderland Nursery Goods Co. v. Baby Trend, Inc.*, 2015 WL 1809309, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2015) (making same observation when case had been pending for 10 months), and “there is more work ahead of the parties and the Court than behind,” *Nike, Inc.*, 2025 WL 439935, at *3. This factor favors a stay.

B. Simplification of the Issues in Question and Trial

“The second factor the Court considers is whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the case.” *Universal Elecs.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1032 (internal quotation omitted). “Waiting for the outcome of the reexamination could eliminate the need for trial if the claims are cancelled or, if the claims survive, facilitate trial by providing the court with expert opinion of the PTO and clarifying the scope of the claims.” *Id.* “A stay may also be granted in order to avoid inconsistent results, obtain guidance from the PTAB, or avoid needless waste of judicial resources. Indeed, it is not uncommon for this court to grant stays pending reexamination prior to the PTO deciding to reexamine the patent.” *PersonalWeb Techs.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d at 1027.

Here, there is no dispute that PGR proceedings could simplify the issues in this case—Hyundai has sought post-grant review of every claim in the Patent, and Germ Dome asserts only a single claim against Hyundai for infringement of that Patent. (*See Opp* at 5 (“Germ Dome does not deny that if the USPTO institutes PGR of the ‘061 Patent, there is a chance the issues in this case will be simplified.”); *see also Wonderland Nursery Goods Co.*, 2015 WL 1809309, at *3 (“First, because Defendants have petitioned for review of all claims asserted in this action, the outcome of the IPR has the potential to be case-dispositive.”). It is true that “the fact that the petition[for PGR] ha[s] not yet been granted or denied makes it more difficult to predict whether the issues are likely to be simplified.” *Universal Elecs.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1033; *see also Nike, Inc.*, 2025 WL 439935, at *3 (“On the one hand, because the PTAB is still deciding whether to institute Defendant’s petitions, simplification is speculative.”). But “courts

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

in this District have adopted the majority position that even if an IPR has not yet been instituted, the simplification factor may still weigh in favor of a stay.” *Nike, Inc.*, 2025 WL 439935, at *3 (internal quotation omitted). “If the PTO grants [PGR] review, the issues would likely be simplified, either through invalidation of claims or by narrowing [Hyundai’s] defenses through estoppel.” *Id.*; *see also Nichia Corp.*, 2018 WL 2448098, at *2 (“Indeed, the record won’t just develop. Estoppel will, too.”). And even if the PTO does not grant PGR review, there will have been no “needless waste of judicial resources.” *PersonalWeb Techs.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d at 1027.

Put another way, Germ Dome’s argument that the Motion is “premature” because there has been no institution decision yet (Mot. at 6) fails to persuade; “[i]t is certainly true that the USPTO may choose not to institute a[PGR], in which case no simplification of issues will result from the stay,” but “if a[PGR] is not instituted, the stay will be relatively short and the action can continue with minimal delay.” *Wonderland Nursery Goods Co.*, 2015 WL 1809309, at *3; *Nichia Corp.*, 2018 WL 2448098, at *2 (“Certainly, that some petitions have not yet been granted makes it difficult to predict whether the issues will be simplified. But even if IPR is not instituted, the stay will be relatively short and the action can continue with minimal delay.”) (citation modified); *Nike, Inc.*, 2025 WL 439935, at *3 (“Also, the risk of delay attending an unnecessary stay is minimal relative to the risk of unnecessary expenditure of resources should the stay be denied and an IPR subsequently commence.”) (internal quotation omitted). “Accordingly, the court finds this factor weighs in favor of a stay.” *Wonderland Nursery Goods Co.*, 2015 WL 1809309, at *4.

C. Undue Prejudice or Clear Tactical Advantage

“Finally, the Court considers whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the nonmoving party.” *Universal Elecs.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1033. “Unlike patent infringement actions involving non-practicing entities, infringement among competitors can cause harm in the marketplace that is not compensable by readily calculable money damages.” *PersonalWeb Techs.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d at 1030. Germ Dome argues that “[w]hile Hyundai is correct that it and Germ Dome are not direct competitors, Germ Dome will still be prejudiced by allowing this case to stagnate for five months while Hyundai continues its infringement,” especially “because the waiting period may only result in a denial of institution

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:25-cv-02593-FWS-DFM

Date: April 20, 2026

Title: Germ Dome Industries LLC v. Hyundai Motor America

of Hyundai's PGR and wasted time without the possibility of early resolution." (Opp. at 5.) The court is not persuaded. "Mere delay in the litigation does not establish undue prejudice." *Universal Elecs.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d at 1033. Indeed, "[c]ourts have repeatedly found no undue prejudice unless the patentee makes a specific showing of prejudice beyond the delay necessarily inherent in any stay." *PersonalWeb Techs.*, 69 F. Supp. 3d at 1029.

In summary, on balance, the court finds the relevant factors weigh in favor of a stay.

III. Disposition

For the foregoing reasons, the Motion is **GRANTED**. This case is **STAYED** pending PGR proceedings. The parties are **ORDERED** to file a status report reflecting the PTO's decision on whether to institute PGR proceedings on or before **August 31, 2026**. If PGR proceedings are not instituted, the parties shall file a stipulation to reopen the case on or before the same date. If PGR proceedings are instituted, the parties shall file a joint status report within **5 court days** of the resolution of the PGR proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.