

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC.
and CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

AT&T CORP. ET AL.

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00486-JRG-RSP
(Lead Case)

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC.
and CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC.

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00487-JRG-RSP
(Member Case)

ASUS TECHNOLOGY LICENSING INC.
and CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A
VERIZON WIRELESS

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00488-JRG-RSP
(Member Case)

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND
CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC.

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00490-JRG
(Lead Case)

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND
CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

AT&T CORP., et al

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00489-JRG
(Member Case)

INNOVATIVE SONIC LIMITED AND
CELERITY IP, LLC

v.

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A
VERIZON WIRELESS

§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00491-JRG
(Member Case)

ORDER

Before the Court is Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Consolidate (the "Motion") filed by Defendants AT&T Corp., AT&T Mobility II LLC, AT&T Services Inc., T-Mobile, USA, Inc., and CellCo Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Defendants"). (Dkt. No. 32 at 1.) The Court previously consolidated six actions against the Defendants into two according to plaintiffs, resulting in the following division:

Asus Technology Licensing Cases	Innovative Sonic Cases
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. AT&T Inc., <i>et al</i> , Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP (Lead Case)	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-00490-JRG (Lead Case)
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. T-Mobile, USA, Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-487-JRG-RSP	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. Verizon Communications Inc., Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-00491-JRG
Asus Technology Licensing Inc., <i>et al</i> v. Verizon Communications Inc., Case No. 2:23-cv-488-JRG-RSP	Innovative Sonic Ltd., <i>et al</i> v. AT&T Inc., <i>et al</i> , Inc. Case No. 2:23-cv-00489-JRG

(*Id.* at 2.)


After consolidation, the Defendants filed their respective Answer & Counterclaims naming ASUSTek Computer Inc. as a Counterclaim-Defendant and asserting counterclaims for (1) declaratory judgment of non-infringement and (2) breach of obligation to negotiate in good faith. (*Id.*, citing, e.g., Case No. 2:23-cv-490-JRG, Dkt. No. 27.) Defendants request that the Court consolidate all cases for pretrial purposes, with Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP designated as the Lead Case. (*Id.*) Plaintiffs do not oppose the relief requested. (*Id.* at 1, 5.)

Having considered the Motion, and noting its unopposed nature, the Court is of the opinion that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Case Nos. 2:23-CV-00490-JRG, 2:23-CV-00489-JRG, and 2:23-CV-00491-JRG are hereby **DECONSOLIDATED**. It is further **ORDERED** that Case Nos. 2:23-CV-00486-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00487-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00488-JRG-RSP, 2:23-CV-00490-JRG, 2:23-CV-00489-JRG,

and 2:23-CV-00491-JRG are hereby **CONSOLIDATED** for the purposes of pretrial. Further, it is **ORDERED** that Case No. 2:23-cv-486-JRG-RSP shall be the lead consolidated case, and that the other consolidated cases shall proceed according to the lead case's docket control order for all pretrial matters.

So Ordered this

Feb 8, 2024



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE