

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

APLIX IP HOLDINGS)
CORPORATION,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Civ. No. 14-cv-12745-MLW
SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT,)
INC.)
and)
SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT)
AMERICA LLC,)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

WOLF, D.J.

September 28, 2015

On June 27, 2014, Aplix IP Holdings Corporation ("Aplix") filed a complaint against Sony Computer Entertainment, Inc. ("SCE") and Sony Computer Entertainment America, LLC ("SCEA") (collectively, "Sony"), alleging infringement of three patents. On October 16, 2014, SCE and SCEA answered in separate filings. Each asserted, among other affirmative defenses, non-infringement and invalidity of the three patents. Additionally, SCEA counterclaimed to seek declaratory judgments of non-infringement and invalidity of those patents. On October 30, 2014, Aplix filed an amended complaint asserting infringement of two additional patents. On December 31, 2014, SCE and SCEA updated their answers and counterclaims to include the two additional patents.

On January 15, 2015, Sony moved to stay this action pending a review by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") of the validity of the five patents at issue in this litigation ("inter partes review"). Sony argued that staying the case pending inter partes review would simplify or moot this litigation, saving the court and parties time and resources. Aplix opposed the motion, arguing that it was premature. Aplix noted that Sony had not yet requested review of the two patents added by the October 30, 2014 amended complaint, and that the PTO had not yet granted inter partes review of any of the disputed patents. Sony's March 31, 2015 reply stated that it had requested review of all five patents. In a series of filings dated between May 22, 2015 and July 29, 2015, Sony notified the court that the PTO has granted inter partes review of each of the five disputed patents.

For the following reasons, the court finds that a stay of this litigation pending inter partes review is appropriate. Therefore, Sony's motion to stay is being allowed.

I. STANDARDS

Congress recently created the inter partes review process through the America Invents Act of 2011. 35 U.S.C. §§311-319. The Act provides that "a person who is not the owner of a patent may file with the [PTO] a petition to institute an inter partes review of the patent." Id. at §311(a). The PTO may grant an inter

partes review only if "there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition." Id. at §314(a). The PTO must generally reach a decision within one year of the granting of a petition for inter partes review. Id. at §316(a)(11).

Inter partes review is barred if a petitioner has filed a civil action challenging the validity of a patent. Id. at §315(a)(1). However, "[a] counterclaim challenging the validity of a claim of a patent does not constitute a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of a patent for purposes of this subsection." Id. at §315(a)(3). If a petitioner "files a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent" on or after the date of the application for inter partes review, "that civil action shall be stayed automatically" until certain motions are filed. Id. at §315(a)(2). The statute does not address the staying of civil actions initiated by a patent owner when defendant has sought inter partes review.

A district court has the inherent power to manage its docket by staying proceedings. Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936); Procter & Gamble Co. v. Kraft Foods Global, Inc., 549 F.3d 842, 848-49 (Fed. Cir. 2008) ("[D]istrict courts have broad discretion to manage their dockets, including the power to grant a stay of proceedings[.]"); Marquis v. FDIC, 965 F.2d 1148, 1154

(1st Cir. 1992) ("It is beyond cavil that, absent a statute or rule to the contrary, federal district courts possess the inherent power to stay pending litigation[.]"). This inherent power includes the power "to stay an action pending the resolution of a related matter in the PTO." In re SDI Technologies, Inc., 456 Fed. App'x 909, 911 (Fed. Cir. 2012); In re Columbia University Patent Litigation, 330 F. Supp. 2d 12, 15 (2004).

Although neither the First Circuit nor the Federal Circuit has spoken to this question in further detail, the district courts have consistently considered three factors to guide their discretion in deciding a motion to stay:

(1) the stage of the litigation, including whether discovery is complete and a trial date has been set; (2) whether a stay will simplify the issues in question and the trial of the case; and (3) whether a stay will unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the nonmoving party.

ACQIS, LLC v. EMC Corp., -- F. Supp. 3d --, 2015 WL 3617106, at *2 (D. Mass. June 10, 2015); see also SCVNGR, Inc. v. eCharge Licensing, LLC, No. 13-cv-12418-DJC, 2014 WL 4804738, at *8 (D. Mass. Sept. 25, 2014); PersonalWeb Technologies, LLC v. Apple Inc., 69 F. Supp. 3d 1022, 1025 (N.D. Cal. 2014); Freeny v. Apple Inc., No. 2:13-CV-00361-WCB, 2014 WL 3611948, at *2 (E.D. Tex. July 22, 2014).

II. ANALYSIS

All three factors weigh in favor of granting a stay pending the resolution of the inter partes review process.

This litigation is in its early stages. Aplix filed its amended complaint approximately eleven months ago. Sony has answered and counterclaimed. However, discovery has not occurred and the court has not set a trial date. Courts have frequently granted motions to stay pending inter partes review at similar or more advanced stages of litigation. See, e.g., ACQIS, 2015 WL 3617106, at *3 (granting stay pending inter partes review where "discovery [wa]s not yet complete, and a trial date ha[d] not been set"); SCVNGR, 2014 WL 4804738, at *9 (stage-of-case factor weighed in favor of stay where "Court ha[d] not set a schedule for discovery or claim construction, never mind trial"); Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC v. Apple, Inc., No. 13-cv-04201-WHA, 2014 WL 93954, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2014) (granting stay where "substantial portions of discovery on the merits of this action ha[d] yet to occur"); e-Watch, Inc v. ACTi Corp., No. SA-12-695, 2013 WL 6334372 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2013) (granting stay pending inter partes review thirteen months after filing of complaint).

This case has progressed far less than cases where courts have declined to issue a stay. See SurfCast, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 6 F. Supp. 3d 136, 142-43 (D. Me. 2014) (denying stay when

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.