

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

LOGANTREE LP,

*Plaintiff,*

vs.

Case No. 17-1217-EFM-KGS

GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, INC. and  
GARMIN USA, INC.,

*Defendants.*

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Defendants Garmin International, Inc., and Garmin USA, Inc. (collectively “Garmin”) move this Court for a stay pending *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of the patent in suit. In addition, Garmin moves the Court for an intra-district transfer for trial to Kanas City, Kansas. As explained below, the Court grants Garmin’s motion to stay the case until the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) issues its decisions regarding Garmin’s IPRs. Furthermore, because the PTAB’s decision could simplify the issues in the case such that Plaintiff LoganTree LP no longer has a claim for infringement, the Court denies Garmin’s motion for intra-district transfer for trial without prejudice.

**I. Factual and Procedural Background**

Plaintiff LoganTree LP filed this patent infringement suit on August 23, 2017, alleging that Garmin’s accelerometer-based activity trackers infringe its U.S. Patent No. 6,059,576 (the

'576 Patent). In February 2018, Garmin filed two petitions for IPR with the PTAB covering 52 of the 185 claims of the '576 Patent. LoganTree did not file a Patent Owner Preliminary Response, and on August 30, 2018, the PTAB instituted the IPRs on all grounds. The PTAB is expected to complete the proceedings and issue its final decisions by August 30, 2019.

In August 2018, Garmin moved for intra-district transfer for trial to Kansas City, Kansas (Doc. 26). It also filed a Motion to Stay Case Pending *Inter Partes* Review of the '576 Patent (Doc. 32). Because of Garmin's motion to stay the case, the Court cancelled the scheduling conference set for September 18, 2018. As a result, the parties have not served or completed any discovery, infringement contentions, or invalidity contentions.

## II. Legal Standard

The Court considers three factors when deciding whether to stay judicial proceedings pending IPR: "(1) whether discovery is complete and a trial date has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and trial of the case; and (3) whether a stay would unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the nonmoving party."<sup>1</sup> These factors help the Court to determine "whether the benefits of a stay outweigh the inherent costs of postponing resolution of the litigation."<sup>2</sup> In the District of Kansas, there is a "liberal policy in favor of granting motions to stay proceedings pending the outcome of [the PTAB's] reexamination or reissuance

---

<sup>1</sup> *Digital Ally, Inc. v. Taser Int'l, Inc.*, 2017 WL 1048351, at \*2 (D. Kan. 2017) (citations omitted).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*

proceedings.”<sup>3</sup> The moving party bears the burden of showing that a stay is appropriate, and this showing must include more than the simple fact that an IPR was filed.<sup>4</sup>

### III. Analysis

#### A. Garmin’s Motion to Stay

##### 1. *Stage of Litigation*

The first factor the court considers in determining whether to stay the case is the stage of the proceedings. This case is in its infancy. Upon the filing of Garmin’s motion, the court postponed the initial scheduling conference. No schedule has been set; no discovery has been conducted; no depositions have been conducted, and no *Markman* hearing has been set. The parties have only exchanged Rule 26 initial disclosures. LoganTree claims that this case has been active for almost two years and should not be delayed any further. The Court acknowledges that this lawsuit was initially filed in the Western District of Texas, but there was no action in the Texas litigation that would weigh against granting a stay. Therefore, because this lawsuit is in its initial stages, this factor weighs in favor of a stay.<sup>5</sup>

##### 2. *Simplification of the Issues*

The second factor the Court considers is whether a stay of this litigation pending Garmin’s IPRs will result in the simplification or elimination of the issues for the Court to consider in this case. The ’576 Patent contains 185 claims. Three of these claims are independent (claims 1, 13,

---

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* (quoting *Norred v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 2014 WL 554685, at \*1 (D. Kan. 2014)).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at \*2.

<sup>5</sup> *See Norred*, 2014 WL 554685, at \*2 (finding that case was in its infancy where little discovery had taken place even when the dispute arose two years before filing); *Digital Ally*, 2017 WL 1048351, at \*2 (granting a stay even when the parties conducted significant discovery, exchanged contentions, and claim construction).

and 20) and the remaining 182 claims are dependent on claims 1, 13, or 20. At this point, LoganTree has not specifically identified which of the 185 claims in the '576 Patent it intends to assert against Garmin.

Garmin's IPRs challenge 50 the '576 Patent's claims, including the three independent claims.<sup>6</sup> Garmin contends that the IPRs will cover all of the claimed subject matter that could possibly be asserted against it in this litigation, and thus will simplify or eliminate all of the issues for trial. In response, LoganTree argues that simply because the PTAB is going to review all of the challenged claims does not necessarily mean that Garmin will be successful. LoganTree points out that PTAB found that Garmin failed to show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on 11 of the 50 challenged claims.<sup>7</sup> LoganTree further argues that even if Garmin is successful on all of its challenged claims, the subject matter of the 50 challenged claims does not overlap with the remaining unchallenged claims of the '576 Patent.

After considering the parties' arguments, the Court concludes that the PTAB's decisions will help simplify or eliminate the issues in this case. Although LoganTree contends that the unchallenged claims do not contain overlapping subject matter with the challenged claims, LoganTree has not identified a single claim that it could assert against Garmin in this litigation that is not nearly identical to one challenged in the IPRs. Furthermore, the fact the PTO is only reviewing some but not all of the '576 Patent's claims does not mean that the PTAB's decision is

---

<sup>6</sup> Garmin did not separately challenge claim 13 under the same primary reference as claim 1 in its petitions for IPR. Garmin argues, however, that because claims 1 and 13 have overlapping subject matter, the PTAB's decision on the patentability of claim 1 will carry over to claim 13.

<sup>7</sup> The PTAB's standard for instituting an IPR is "a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition." 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). Thus, a petitioner need only establish a reasonable likelihood of proceeding on one claim for the PTAB to institute a review on all the challenged claims. *See SAS Inst., Inc. v. Iancu*, 138 S. Ct. 1348, 1353 (2018) (stating that when the PTAB initiates an IPR it must review all of the challenged claims).

irrelevant or unhelpful to this litigation. Other courts have found that the benefits of a stay remain even when only some of the litigated claims are being reviewed.<sup>8</sup> As Garmin asserts, a stay pending resolution of the IPRs has significant potential to eliminate asserted claims and invalidity defenses in this case and will simplify the issues in this litigation. This factor weighs in favor of a stay.

### 3. *Prejudice or Clear Tactical Disadvantage*

The third factor that the Court must consider in determining whether to grant a stay is undue prejudice or clear tactical disadvantage to the nonmoving party. In evaluating this factor, “courts have taken a practical approach to determining whether the non-movant will suffer undue prejudice from a stay. A court may deny a request for a stay where the movant has unjustifiably delayed seeking reexamination, or where the stay will do nothing but delay the proceedings.”<sup>9</sup> Mere delay in the litigation does not establish undue prejudice.<sup>10</sup>

Garmin argues that a stay pending Garmin’s IPRs would not unduly prejudice LoganTree. Garmin argues that LoganTree is not a competitor of Garmin and has no products on the market embodying the claims of the ‘576 Patent. Thus, according to Garmin, any purported harm to LoganTree may be fully compensated with money damages. Garmin also asserts that there is little tactical disadvantage to LoganTree, where this litigation is in its early stages. IPRs must be

---

<sup>8</sup> See *Trading Technologies, Int’l, Inc. v. BCG Partners, Inc.*, 186 F. Supp. 3d 870, 875 (N.D. Ill. 2016) (compiling cases); *Destination Maternity Corp. v. Target Corp.*, 12 F. Supp. 3d 762, 769 (E.D. Pa. 2014) (“courts have found significant potential for issue simplification even in cases where some but not all of the asserted claims are subject to PTO review”).

<sup>9</sup> *Digital Ally*, 2017 WL 1048351, at \*3 (quoting *Dane Techs., Inc. v. Gatekeeper Sys., Inc.*, 2013 WL 4483355, at \*2 (D. Minn. 2013)).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* (citing *Universal Elecs., Inc. v. Universal Remote Control, Inc.*, 943 F. Supp. 2d 1028, 1033 (C.D. Cal. 2013)).

# 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.