

1 John V. Picone III (CA Bar No. 187226)
2 jpicone@spencerfane.com
3 **SPENCER FANE LLP**
4 225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500
5 San Jose, California 95113
6 Telephone: 408.286.5100
7 Facsimile: 408.286.5722

8 Erick S. Robinson (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
9 erobinson@spencerfane.com
10 **SPENCER FANE LLP**
11 816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1200
12 Austin Texas 78701
13 Telephone: 512.840.4550
14 Facsimile: 512.840.4551

15 Brian T. Bear (*Pro Hac Vice appl. pending*)
16 bbear@spencerfane.com
17 **SPENCER FANE LLP**
18 1000 Walnut Street, Suite 1400
19 Kansas City, Missouri 64106
20 Telephone: 816.474.8100
21 Facsimile: 816.474.3216

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff
23 MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES LLC

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-CV-00896-WHA

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION
TO STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING
INTER PARTES REVIEW**

Date: May 23, 2024
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Place: Courtroom 12

Jud. Officer: William H. Alsup

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

NOTICE OF MOTION

In accordance with Local Rules 7-2(b) PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on Thursday, May 23, 2024 at 8:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the Court permits, this matter will be heard before the Honorable William Alsup of the above-identified court, located at San Francisco Courthouse, Courtroom 12, 19th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102.

Plaintiff Mobile Data Technologies, LLC (“MDT” or “Plaintiff”) will and hereby does move the Court to stay this case until the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) either (1) declines to institute trial on the Petitions for Inter Partes Review (“IPRs”) involving the Patents-in-Suit or (2) issues Final Written Decisions (“FWDs”) in those IPRs that may be instituted.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

In accordance with Local Rule 7-4, the sole issue to be decided on this unopposed motion is whether these proceedings should be stayed pending PTAB’s consideration of whether to institute IPRs of the Patents in Suit, and if all IPRs are instituted, stayed until PTAB issues FWDs.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Mobile Data Technologies, LLC, (“MDT” or “Plaintiff”), without opposition from Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta” or “Defendant”), respectfully moves this Court to stay the instant proceedings pending non-institution and/or FWDs related to the Petitions for Inter Partes Review (“IPRs”) that Meta filed against each of the Patents-in-Suit. Plaintiff seeks this stay to conserve the parties’ resources and streamline the instant case, which was recently transferred from the Western District of Texas (“WDTX”) to this Court. Prior to filing this motion, counsel for Plaintiff met and conferred with Defendant’s counsel over the telephone and provided a draft copy of this motion. Opposing counsel indicated that Defendant did not oppose this motion.

1 In support, MDT incorporates the contemporaneously filed written declaration by MDT's
2 counsel affirming the facts set forth in this motion pursuant to Local Rule 7-5 (Ex. 1). A proposed
3 order is attached pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(c). Further MDT states as follows:

4 **II. FACTS RELATED TO PROCEDURAL POSTURE**

5 The following facts are affirmed by counsel's declaration filed with the instant motion (EX.
6 1). WDTX recently transferred this matter to this Court in response to Defendant's contested Sec.
7 1404 Motion which sought transfer based on forum convenience. Prior to transfer, the parties had
8 engaged in venue-related discovery, served initial infringement and invalidity contentions, and
9 fully briefed, but did not argue, the *Markman* hearing. The Parties had also exchanged Rule 26
10 disclosures and made initial merits discovery requests; however, this matter was transferred prior
11 to the date in which the Parties were to respond to their respective requests. As such, the Parties
12 have not exchanged any merits discovery as of the date of this motion. Effectively, this case comes
13 before this Court with significant work to be done for the Parties to prepare for trial.

14 Prior to the transfer, Meta filed six Petitions for Inter Partes Review seeking to invalidate
15 each of the Patents-in-Suit and all claims that have been asserted in this proceeding. As part of
16 each of the Petitions, Meta filed a *Soltera* stipulation, which is an assurance with the Patent and
17 Trademark Office that it would forgo any invalidity argument in this action that it could have
18 brought before PTAB should the matter be instituted.¹ Identification of the relevant IPR petitions,
19
20
21

22
23
24 ¹ For example, Meta stated in its initial Petition in IPR2024-00246 at 4:

25 Nor do the Fintiv factors support discretionary denial under §314(a). The pending
26 litigation against Petitioner is in relatively early stages, with no substantive
27 discovery having taken place to date. Nevertheless, to allay concerns over
28 duplication of efforts, **Petitioner represents that, in the event of institution, it will not pursue in litigation any invalidity defense that was or could have been raised in IPR.**

1 the respective institution decision dates, and if instituted, the expected Final Written Decision dates,
2 are set forth in the below table:

IPR	Patent	Petition Filed	Patent Owner Preliminary Response Filed	Estimated Institution Decision Deadline ²	Estimated Final Written Decision Deadline ³
IPR2024-00246	8793336	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025
IPR2024-00247	8825801	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025
IPR2024-00248	9032039	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025
IPR2024-00249	9619578	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025
IPR2024-00250	9922348	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025
IPR2024-00251	10839427	Dec. 6, 2023	Mar. 13, 2024	June 13, 2024	June 13, 2025

12 III. STANDARD FOR GRANTING A STAY

13 “Courts have inherent power to manage their dockets and stay proceedings, including the
14 authority to order a stay pending conclusion of a PTO reexamination.” *Evolutionary Intel., LLC v.*
15 *Apple, Inc.*, No. C 13-04201 WHA, 2014 WL 93954, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2014) (Alsup, J.)
16 (citing *Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg*, 849 F.2d 1422, 1426–27 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citation omitted). “In
17 determining whether to grant a stay pending reexamination, courts consider: (1) whether discovery
18 is complete and whether a trial date has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in
19 question and trial of the case; and (3) whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear
20 tactical disadvantage to the non-moving party.” *Evolutionary Intel., LLC*, 2014 WL 93954, at *2.

22 IV. EACH FACTOR FAVORS GRANTING A LIMITED STAY IN THIS PROCEEDING

24 As this Court may appreciate, this motion comes before it with Plaintiff, not Defendant,
25 affirmatively seeking a stay. This oddity is due to the unique posture in which this case comes
26

27 ² Due within three months after filing of Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response. 35 U.S.C. §314(b)(1).

28 ³ Due within one year from institution. 5 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c).

1 before the Court. When this matter was in WDTX, that court had set an aggressive trial date set,
2 which would have concluded prior to any final written decisions (“FWD”) before the Patent and
3 Trademark Appeal Board (“PTAB”). Plaintiff is cognizant that any trial date assigned here would
4 be well-after the PTAB institution decisions in the IPRs in two months, and likely, after the
5 expected issuance of any FWDs in 14 months. Moreover, as set forth above, no merits discovery,
6 other than serving initial Rule 26 disclosures, was conducted in the preceding forum. As such, the
7 first factor flows in favor of granting a stay—merits discovery has not effectively started, and any
8 trial date that would be set would almost certainly be set well-after any FWDs are handed down by
9 PTAB.
10

11 As to the second factor, Plaintiff believes that the institution decisions and any FWDs will
12 simply the issues in the case whether the IPRs are instituted, not instituted, or partially instituted.
13 In other words, any outcome from PTAB will streamline the relevant issues in this proceeding.
14

15 First, if instituted, Defendant will be required as part of their *Soltera* stipulation to abandon
16 several of its invalidity theories set forth in its existing invalidity contentions. For Plaintiff, in a
17 situation where all petitions are instituted, MDT would prefer to expend its resources contesting
18 the PTAB proceedings rather than committing resources to litigating—through a *Markman* hearing,
19 merits discovery, and dispositive motions—a patent which PTAB has indicated a likelihood of
20 partial or total invalidity.
21

22 Second, if none of the petitions are instituted, the written decision from PTAB declining
23 institution would be in hand by June 13, 2024, the same day as the CMC. PTAB’s written decisions
24 electing to not institute the petition may provide helpful analysis regarding claim construction and
25 the prior art which may cause the parties to amend their infringement or invalidity contention.
26 Given that the decision would on the same day or sooner than the CMC, the tradeoff in delay for
27 the parties is nonexistent while the utility in having refined infringement and invalidity theories
28

1 *before* engaging in merits discovery is high. Moreover, if none of the IPRs are instituted, this is
2 motion itself becomes a nullity.

3 Third, if only some of the IPRs are instituted, Plaintiff will likely seek to streamline this
4 proceeding to only assert patents which are not subject to PTAB’s review, which would yield the
5 same benefits as stated above.

6
7 As to the third factor, prejudice to the non-moving party, most motions to stay come to this
8 Court by Defendants, and so almost universally, the concept of “prejudice” from a stay are from
9 the perspective of a patent plaintiff resisting a stay. In most cases, undersigned counsel would
10 contest the need for a stay, but given the posture outline above, this is a rare instance where it makes
11 sense for a plaintiff to acquiesce to a stay. Given that Meta’s is not opposed to this motion, there
12 is no prejudice to the non-moving party in granting the stay.

13
14 **V. CONCLUSION**

15 For these reasons, MDT respectfully asks that this Court stay this matter pending either (1)
16 a decision from PTAB declining to not institute proceeding as to at least one of the patents in suit,
17 or (2) PTAB issuing final written decisions for the above proceedings.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: April 18, 2024

SPENCER FANE LLP

By: /s/ Erick S. Robinson

John V. Picone III (CA Bar No. 187226)
jpicone@spencerfane.com
SPENCER FANE LLP
225 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 1500
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: 408.286.5100
Facsimile: 408.286.5722

Erick S. Robinson (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
erobinson@spencerfane.com
SPENCER FANE LLP
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1200
Austin Texas 78701
Telephone: 512.840.4550
Facsimile: 512.840.4551

Brian T. Bear (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
bbear@spencerfane.com
SPENCER FANE LLP
1000 Walnut Street, Suite 1400
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Telephone: 816.474.8100
Facsimile: 816.474.3216

Attorneys for Plaintiff