

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,
LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., and
LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM
U.S.A., INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 12-1595-LPS

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BLACKBERRY LIMITED and
BLACKBERRY CORPORATION,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 12-1597-LPS

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC
f/k/a MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 12-1601-LPS

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS
(USA) INC., f/k/a SONY ERICSSON
MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,
SONY CORPORATION, and SONY
CORPORATION OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 12-1602-LPS

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

C.A. No. 13-919-LPS

ARENDI S.A.R.L.,

Plaintiff,

v.

OATH HOLDINGS INC. and
OATH INC.,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 13-920-LPS

ORDER

At Wilmington this **31st** day of **March, 2022**:

For the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Opinion issued this date,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Arendi's motion to exclude portions of Dr. Thomas Vander Veen's expert report (C.A. No. 12-1595 D.I. 268) is **DENIED**.

2. Arendi's motion to exclude portions of Ms. Michele Riley's expert report (C.A. No. 13-920 D.I. 238) is **GRANTED**.

3. The motions of all Defendants except BlackBerry to exclude opinions and testimony of Dr. M. Laurentius Marais (C.A. No. 12-1595 D.I. 266; C.A. No. 12-1601 D.I. 279; C.A. No. 12-1602 D.I. 230; C.A. No. 13-919 D.I. 283; C.A. No. 13-920 D.I. 241) are **DENIED**.

4. BlackBerry's motion to exclude opinions and testimony of Dr. M. Laurentius Marais (C.A. No. 12-1597 D.I. 200) is **GRANTED**.

5. All Defendants' motions to exclude testimony of Mr. Roy Weinstein (C.A. No. 12-1595 D.I. 270; C.A. No. 12-1597 D.I. 203; C.A. No. 12-1601 D.I. 282; C.A. No. 12-1602 D.I. 236; C.A. No. 13-919 D.I. 286; C.A. No. 13-920 D.I. 246) are **DENIED**.

6. BlackBerry's motion for summary judgment of no pre-suit damages (C.A. No. 12-1597 D.I. 207) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.

7. Because the Memorandum Opinion is filed under seal, the parties shall meet and confer and, no later than **April 4**, submit a proposed redacted version, accompanied by a supporting memorandum, detailing how, under applicable law, the Court may approve any requested redactions. In the absence of a timely, compliant request, the Court will unseal the entire opinion.

8. These cases will be **REASSIGNED** to the Vacant Judgeship (2022) after the Court docket a public version of its Memorandum Opinion.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT