

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

District of Delaware

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 12/10/2020 at 8:57 AM EST and filed on 12/10/2020

Case Name: Midwest Energy Emissions Corp. et al v. AEP Generation Resources Inc. et al

Case Number: [1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB](#)

Filer:

Document Number: 253(No document attached)

Docket Text:

ORAL ORDER ORAL ORDER: The Court, having reviewed the Talen and NRG Defendants' (the "Moving Defendants") Motion to Stay the Case Pending Inter Partes Review, ("motion"), (D.I. 234), and the parties' briefing and submission of subsequent information related thereto, (D.I. 235; D.I. 241; D.I. 246; D.I. 252), having heard argument on December 9, 2020, and having considered the three stay-related factors, hereby ORDERS that the Motion is GRANTED and Plaintiffs' patent infringement claims against the Moving Defendants with respect to the asserted patents (United States Patent Nos. 8,168,147 ("147 patent"), 10,343,114 ("114 patent"), 10,589,225 ("225 patent"), 10,596,517 ("517 patent") and 10,668,430 ("430 patent" and collectively with the '225 patent and the '417 patent, the "newly-asserted patents")) are STAYED until at least final written decisions have been entered regarding Moving Defendants' inter partes review ("IPR") petitions that have been instituted against the '114 patent and the '147 patent. As to the '114 patent and the '147 patent, the motion is not difficult. With respect to the "simplification" factor, nearly all asserted claims (but for two dependent claims asserted against the NRG Defendants) are at issue in the IPR proceedings. Thus, there is a very good chance that the parties and the Court could engage in a significant amount of pre-trial work, only to have the PTAB end up invalidating nearly all asserted claims (or otherwise issuing decisions that will have a significant bearing on the patent infringement claims in this matter, including regarding the priority date of the '114 patent). (D.I. 235 at 9-11; D.I. 246 at 2-4) With respect to the "stage of the litigation" factor, this case is in its early stages. There have not yet been any depositions; claim construction briefing is not set to begin until March 2021 with the Markman hearing scheduled for July 2021; opening expert reports are due in April 2022 and a first trial is set for January 9, 2023. (D.I. 235 at 11-12; D.I. 246 at 4-6; see also D.I. 140) With respect to the "relationship between the parties" prong of the "undue prejudice" factor, the Moving Defendants do not directly compete with Plaintiffs, and the case is currently already stayed against the other Refined Coal Defendants (with the Court having previously found that Plaintiffs showing of harm with respect to those Defendants was "not robust"). (D.I. 235 at 13; D.I. 166) And the other subfactors with respect to "undue prejudice" also support a stay, with: (1) Moving Defendants' IPR petitions having been timely filed; (2) the instant motion having been filed promptly after the PTAB issued its institution decisions with respect to the '114 patent; and (3) the IPR proceedings now underway with respect to both the '114 patent and the '147 patent. (D.I. 235 at 12-14; D.I. 246 at 6-8) The only difficult wrinkle with respect to the motion is whether a stay of the entire case makes sense, in light of the fact that there are five asserted patents at play here, including the three newly-asserted patents for which IPR petitions have not yet been filed (in light of the applicable statutory waiting period of nine months from the date of the grant of a patent). (D.I. 235 at 12) But for the following reasons, a stay of the entire case as to the Moving Defendants makes sense, even though no IPR has yet been instituted on those three newly-asserted patents: (1) All five asserted patents are from the same patent family, share the same title, share the same inventors, relate to similar technology and are asserted against the same infringing conduct. (D.I. 130 at paragraphs 237, 270, 304, 333, 362; D.I. 235 at 7; D.I. 246 at 2-3); (2) Even Plaintiffs have acknowledged that, in light of this, there is significant overlap among the patents (i.e., with regard to relevant claim terminology, relevant witnesses, etc.). Indeed, during oral argument, Plaintiffs' counsel admitted that in light of such overlap, it would be complicated to stay the case only as to the '114 patent and the '147 patent but not as to the newly-asserted patents.; (3) Further, it is reasonable to expect that there will be arguments made and decisions issued regarding claim scope, claim construction, and invalidity issues in the IPR proceedings for the '114 patent and the '147 patent that will have an impact on the newly-asserted patents. (D.I. 235 at 9-10; D.I. 246 at 2-4); (4) Moreover, Moving Defendants have confirmed that they intend to promptly file IPR petitions with respect to the newly-asserted

patents following the expiration of the statutory waiting periods, and that prior art that is at issue in the '114 patent and the '147 patent IPR proceedings will also be put at issue with regard to these to-be-filed IPR petitions; and (5) If it turns out that the PTAB does not institute IPR on some or all of the newly-asserted patents, Plaintiffs would of course be free to update the Court regarding that and to move to lift the stay, if they believe that is warranted. Accordingly, the case is STAYED as set out above. Additionally, the parties shall jointly notify the Court by letter within 10 days after any of the following events occurs: (1) Moving Defendants file IPR petitions with respect any of the newly-asserted patents; (2) the PTAB issues institution decisions with respect to any of those patents; and (3) the PTAB issues Final Written Decisions with respect to the IPR proceedings for either of the '114 and '147 patents. The parties shall also submit a joint status report on the IPR proceedings 90 days after entry of this order and every 90 days thereafter. (D.I. 235 at 15). Ordered by Judge Christopher J. Burke on 12/10/2020. (dlb)

1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Jack B. Blumenfeld jbbefiling@mnat.com

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (Terminated) cottrell@rlf.com, christine-renshaw-0118@ecf.pacerpro.com, renshaw@rlf.com

Robert Scott Saunders rob.saunders@skadden.com, cherie.krebs@skadden.com, lauren.karpinski@skadden.com, mlcwil@skadden.com, rob-saunders-5945@ecf.pacerpro.com, skadden-3197@ecf.pacerpro.com

Francis DiGiovanni francis.digiovanni@faegredrinker.com, DocketGeneral@faegredrinker.com, cathlyn.cantelmi@faegredrinker.com, mark.ruggiero@faegredrinker.com

Rodger Dallery Smith, II (Terminated) rdsefiling@mnat.com, rsmith@mnat.com

James Michael Lennon jlennon@devlinlawfirm.com, dlflitparas@devlinlawfirm.com, jnemunaitis@caldwellcc.com, mdelaney@caldwellcc.com, midwest@caldwellcc.com, mmcclain@devlinlawfirm.com, vschad@devlinlawfirm.com

Brian P. Egan began@mnat.com, bpeefiling@mnat.com

Paul R. Morico paul.morico@bakerbotts.com, susan.bigler@bakerbotts.com

Thatcher A. Rahmeier thatcher.rahmeier@faegredrinker.com

Elizabeth Durham Flannery liz.flannery@bakerbotts.com, susan.bigler@bakerbotts.com

Syed K. Fareed syed.fareed@bakerbotts.com, syed-fareed-3858@ecf.pacerpro.com

Joseph Evall JEvall@gibsondunn.com, DAdler@gibsondunn.com

Jessica R. Kunz jessica.kunz@skadden.com, christopher.heaney@skadden.com, ecf-142c15ead948@ecf.pacerpro.com

Christa Brown-Sanford (Terminated) Christa.sanford@bakerbotts.com

Ali Dhanani ali.dhanani@bakerbotts.com, deborah.saucier@bakerbotts.com

David J. Tobin david.tobin@bakerbotts.com

Paul J. Kremer pkremer@gibsondunn.com

Tyler E. Cragg (Terminated) cragg@rlf.com, jennifer-marcolini-4759@ecf.pacerpro.com, marcolini@rlf.com

Thomas B. Carter, Jr thomas.carter@bakerbotts.com

Richard W. Mark RMark@gibsondunn.com, lfanady@gibsondunn.com

Emily Pyclik emily.pyclik@bakerbotts.com

John C. Williams john.c.williams@bakerbotts.com, bbipparaus@bakerbotts.com

1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB Filer will deliver document by other means to:

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

District of Delaware

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 1/7/2021 at 5:04 PM EST and filed on 1/7/2021

Case Name: Midwest Energy Emissions Corp. et al v. AEP Generation Resources Inc. et al

Case Number: [1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB](#)

Filer:

Document Number: 263(No document attached)

Docket Text:

ORAL ORDER: The Court, having reviewed the December 16, 2020 letter jointly submitted by Plaintiffs and the Refined Coal Defendants, (D.I. 255), hereby ORDERS as follows: (1) For all of the reasons set forth by the Refined Coal Defendants, (id. at 2-4), the Court agrees that the stay in favor of the inter partes review proceedings, (D.I. 253), shall also apply to the Refined Coal Defendants.; (2) In light of the stay, the pending motions, (D.I. 172; D.I. 175; D.I. 176; D.I. 178; D.I. 218) are denied without prejudice to renew, if necessary, if/when the stay is lifted in the future. (To the extent any such motions are later re-filed, if the parties feel it would be most efficient for the Court to rely on some or all of the briefing relating to the currently-filed motions, the parties can advise the Court of this at the relevant time and the Court will do so.); (3) The hearing set for January 19, 2021 regarding these motions is CANCELLED.; and (4) With regard to Plaintiffs' concerns regarding obtaining discovery with respect to the identity of certain John Doe Defendants, (D.I. 255 at 1-2), the Court is open to considering carving out of the stay the ability for Plaintiffs to conduct targeted, limited discovery with regard to that issue. By no later than January 15, 2021, Plaintiffs and the Refined Coal Defendants shall meet and confer and submit a joint status report of no more than 3 single-spaced pages that advises the Court whether they have reached agreement on any such targeted discovery, and if they have not, provides the parties' respective views regarding the scope of any such discovery that should/should not be permitted with respect to this issue.. Signed by Judge Christopher J. Burke on 1/7/2021. (dlb)

1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Jack B. Blumenfeld jbbefiling@mnat.com

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (Terminated) cottrell@rlf.com, christine-renshaw-0118@ecf.pacerpro.com, renshaw@rlf.com

Robert Scott Saunders rob.saunders@skadden.com, cherie.krebs@skadden.com, lauren.karpinski@skadden.com, mlcwil@skadden.com, rob-saunders-5945@ecf.pacerpro.com, skadden-3197@ecf.pacerpro.com

Francis DiGiovanni francis.digiovanni@faegredrinker.com, DocketGeneral@faegredrinker.com, cathlyn.cantelmi@faegredrinker.com, mark.ruggiero@faegredrinker.com

Rodger Dallery Smith, II (Terminated) rdsefiling@mnat.com, rsmith@mnat.com

James Michael Lennon jlennon@devlinlawfirm.com, dlflitparas@devlinlawfirm.com, jnemunaitis@caldwellcc.com, mdelaney@caldwellcc.com, midwest@caldwellcc.com, mmclain@devlinlawfirm.com, vschad@devlinlawfirm.com

Brian P. Egan began@mnat.com, bpeefiling@mnat.com

Paul R. Morico paul.morico@bakerbotts.com, susan.bigler@bakerbotts.com

Thatcher A. Rahmeier thatcher.rahmeier@faegredrinker.com

Elizabeth Durham Flannery liz.flannery@bakerbotts.com, susan.bigler@bakerbotts.com

PAC ET AL. EXHIBIT 1163

Page 4

Syed K. Fareed syed.fareed@bakerbotts.com, syed-fareed-3858@ecf.pacerpro.com

Joseph Evall JEvall@gibsondunn.com, DAdler@gibsondunn.com

Jessica R. Kunz jessica.kunz@skadden.com, christopher.heaney@skadden.com, ecf-142c15ead948@ecf.pacerpro.com

Christa Brown-Sanford (Terminated) Christa.sanford@bakerbotts.com

Ali Dhanani ali.dhanani@bakerbotts.com, deborah.saucier@bakerbotts.com

David J. Tobin david.tobin@bakerbotts.com

Paul J. Kremer pkremer@gibsondunn.com

Tyler E. Cragg (Terminated) cragg@rlf.com, jennifer-marcolini-4759@ecf.pacerpro.com, marcolini@rlf.com

Thomas B. Carter, Jr thomas.carter@bakerbotts.com

Richard W. Mark RMark@gibsondunn.com, lfanady@gibsondunn.com

Emily Pyclik emily.pyclik@bakerbotts.com

John C. Williams john.c.williams@bakerbotts.com, bbipparaus@bakerbotts.com

1:19-cv-01334-RGA-CJB Filer will deliver document by other means to: