










## Documents Search

4 Results

Judges: Alan D. Albright Types of Document: Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review Results of Motion: Denied

	PDF ... ▲	Type of Document	Result of Mot...	Case	Date	
—		Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Continental Intermodal Group - Trucking LLC v. Sand Revolution LLC et al 7-18-cv-00147 (WDTX)	Jul. 22, 2020	 
		Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage</b> Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Simplification of Issues</b> Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Stage of Litigation</b>		The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending <i>inter partes</i> review because the stage of the case, lack of potential simplification of issues, and undue prejudice to plaintiff weighed against a stay. "The Court denies this motion for at least the following reasons: (1) The Court strongly believes the Seventh Amendment, (2) This case has been pending [for three years] and staying the case would only further delay its resolution, (3) Denying the stay would allow the Parties to obtain a more timely and complete resolution of infringement, invalidity, and damages issues, and (4) Plaintiff opposes the stay."		
		Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Solas OLED Ltd. v. Google, Inc. 6-19-cv-00515 (WDTX)	Jun. 23, 2020	 
		Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Solas OLED Ltd. v. Dell Technologies Inc. 6-19-cv-00514 (WDTX)	Jun. 23, 2020	 
—		Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review	Denied	Multimedia Content Management LLC v. DISH Network LLC 6-18-cv-00207 (WDTX)	May. 30, 2019	 
		Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Prejudice From Stay/Tactical Advantage</b> Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Simplification of Issues</b> Stay of Proceedings └ Factors Considered └ <b>Stage of Litigation</b>		The court denied defendant's motion to stay pending its petitions for <i>inter partes</i> review because the undue prejudice to plaintiff, stage of the case, and lack of potential simplification of issues weighed against a stay. "[Defendant] elected to file their Petitions long after suit was filed and even waited until after the <i>Markman</i> hearing. . . . [Defendant] was free to choose when to file for the IPRs. However, having waited this long to file is a factor that the Court will consider. . . . [T]he Court finds that [defendant] failed to act with reasonable dispatch in filing their petitions for <i>inter partes</i> review and their subsequent motion to stay. . . . [E]ven if institution is granted, [defendant's] IPRs would not simplify the issues in this case. The Court has already resolved the meaning of the claim terms as a matter of law."		

NTT EX2019  
MediaTek v. NTT  
IPR2020-1404