

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

**BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.**  
Jeremy J. Taylor (SBN 249075)  
jeremy.taylor@bakerbotts.com  
Arya Moshiri (SBN 324231)  
arya.moshiri@bakerbotts.com  
101 California St., Ste. 3600  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.291.6200  
Facsimile: 415.291.6300

Kurt M. Pankratz (*pro hac vice*)  
Bethany R. Salpietra (*pro hac vice*)  
kurt.pankratz@bakerbotts.com  
bethany.salpietra@bakerbotts.com  
2001 Ross Ave., Ste. 900  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: 214.953.6500  
Facsimile: 214.953.6503

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Lyft, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

LYFT, INC.

Plaintiff,

v.

AGIS SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:21-cv-04653-BLF

**PLAINTIFF LYFT, INC.’S NOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION TO STAY  
PENDING PATENT OFFICE  
PROCEEDINGS INVOLVING THE  
PATENTS-IN-SUIT**

Date: August 11, 2022  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman  
Trial Date: October 16, 2023  
Courtroom: 3, Fifth Floor

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

	<b>Page</b>
I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD .....	3
III. THE COURT SHOULD EXERCISE ITS DISCRETION TO STAY PENDING PATENT OFFICE PROCEEDINGS .....	4
A. Stage of Litigation .....	4
B. Simplification of Issues .....	5
C. Undue Prejudice .....	7
1. <u>Timing of the Stay Request</u> .....	7
2. <u>Status of the USPTO Proceedings</u> .....	7
3. <u>Timing of the USPTO Review Requests</u> .....	8
4. <u>The Relationship of the Parties</u> .....	9
IV. CONCLUSION .....	10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****CASES**

1		
2		
3	<b>CASES</b>	
4	<i>AGIS Software Development LLC v. Google LLC</i> ,	
5	No. 2:19-cv-00361 (E.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2019), ECF No. 1 .....	2
6	<i>AGIS Software Development LLC v. Lyft, Inc.</i> ,	
7	No. 2:21-cv-00024 (E.D. Tex. Jan 29, 2021), ECF No. 1.....	2, 9
8	<i>AGIS Software Development LLC v. T-Mobile USA, Inc. et al.</i> ,	
9	No. 2:21-cv-00072 (E.D. Tex. Jan 19, 2021), ECF No. 334.....	2
10	<i>Asetek Holdings, Inc. v. Cooler Master Co.</i> ,	
11	No. 13-cv-00457-JST, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47134 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2014).....	6-7, 9
12	<i>Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. GSI Tech., Inc.</i> ,	
13	No. 13-cv-02013-JST, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142858 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2014) .....	5
14	<i>Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg</i> ,	
15	849 F.2d 1422 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	3
16	<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Fireeye, Inc.</i> ,	
17	No. C 13-03133 SBA, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75456 (N.D. Cal. May 30, 2014).....	4
18	<i>GoPro, Inc. v. C&amp;A Mktg.</i> ,	
19	No. 16-cv-03590-JST, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92480 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2017).....	5, 7, 9
20	<i>Gould v. Control Laser Corp.</i> ,	
21	705 F.2d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	3, 6-7
22	<i>In re Cygnus Telecomms. Tech., LLC</i> ,	
23	385 F. Supp. 2d 1022 (N.D. Cal. 2005) .....	3, 6
24	<i>In re Etter</i> ,	
25	756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	7
26	<i>Internet Patents Corp. v. eBags, Inc.</i> ,	
27	No. C 12-03385 SBA, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 122868 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2013) .....	4
28	<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> ,	
	299 U.S. 248 (1936) .....	3
	<i>Mindbasehq Llc v. Google LLC</i> ,	
	No. 21-cv-03603-JST, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 253443 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2021).....	7
	<i>PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	
	69 F.Supp.3d 1022 (N.D. Cal. 2014) .....	4

1 *PersonalWeb Techs., LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
 2 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4095 (N.D. Cal. Jan 13, 2014) ..... 5, 6

3 *Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
 4 No. C 11-0494 EJD, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114763 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 5, 2011) ..... 10

5 *Pragmatus Telecom, LLC v. NETGEAR, Inc.*,  
 6 No. C 12-6198 SBA, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68616 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2013)..... 10

7 *SAGE Electrochromics, Inc. v. View, Inc.*,  
 8 No. 12-cv-06441-JST, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1056 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2015)..... 5, 9

9 *Target Therapeutics, Inc. v. SciMed Life Sys., Inc.*,  
 10 No. C-94-20775 RPA (EAI), 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22517 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 1995) ..... 5

11 *Telemac Corp. v. Teledigital, Inc.*,  
 12 450 F.Supp.2d 1107 (N.D.Cal.2006) ..... 4

13 *Universal Elecs., Inc. v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.*,  
 14 943 F. Supp. 2d 1028 (C.D. Cal. 2013).....5-6

15 *VirtualAgility Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.*,  
 16 759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 9

17 *Yodlee, Inc. v. Ablaise Ltd.*,  
 18 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5429 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 2009) ..... 4

19 **STATUTES**

20 35 U.S.C. § 314(b)(1)..... 3

21 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.104-1.116..... 2

22 37 C.F.R. § 1.550(a).....2-3, 8

23

24

25

26

27

28

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT that on August 11, 2022 at 9:00 A.M., in Courtroom 3, Fifth Floor, of the United States District Court for Northern District of California, San Jose Division, located at 280 South First Street, San Jose, California, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, a hearing will be held by the Honorable Beth Labson Freeman, United States District Judge, on Lyft, Inc.'s ("Lyft") Motion to Stay Pending Patent Office Proceedings Involving the Patents-in-Suit ("Motion"). Lyft, by way of its Motion, seeks an order staying the instant case based on validity challenges at the United States Patent Office ("USPTO") involving four of the five Patents-in-Suit: U.S. Patent Nos. 7,031,728 ("the '728 Patent"), U.S. 7,630,724 ("the '724 Patent"), 10,299,100 ("the '100 Patent"), and 10,341,838 ("the '838 Patent") (collectively, the "Challenged Patents").

This Motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the accompanying declaration of Bethany Salpietra, the pleadings and records on file in this action, and such other written and/or oral arguments as may be presented at or before the time this Motion is taken under submission by the Court.

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

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.