

Exhibit A

From: [Robert Niemeier](#)
To: [Chris Stewart](#); neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo; Service-Honda/Neo; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo; VW-Neo; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; quadrozzi@youngpc.com
Subject: RE: In Re Neo Wireless - Motion to Stay
Date: Monday, May 15, 2023 7:02:45 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Chris,

I think we can succinctly answer your questions as follows: all Defendants are seeking a stay of the entire case through appeals of any post-grant proceeding now, without further caveat or limitation. The law supports Defendants' position and courts commonly grant stays in similar cases where IPR petitions have been instituted. *See Transtex LLC v. WABCO Holdings Inc.*, No. 2:17-cv-12793, 2018 WL 10742464 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 4, 2018). If Neo disagrees, please let us know. We are happy to discuss further on Wednesday.

Best,
Rob

Robert Niemeier
Director
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.
Email: rniemeier@sternekessler.com
Direct: 202.772.8634

From: Chris Stewart <cstewart@caldwellcc.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2023 7:16 PM
To: Robert Niemeier <RNiemeier@sternekessler.com>; neowireless@caldwellcc.com
Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo <SERVICEGMNeo@fr.com>; Service-Honda/Neo <Service-Honda/Neo@fr.com>; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo <SERVICETeslaNeo@fr.com>; VW-Neo <VW-Neo@sternekessler.com>; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; quadrozzi@youngpc.com
Subject: RE: In Re Neo Wireless - Motion to Stay

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Use caution before clicking links or attachments.

Rob et al.,

As I mentioned in the other thread, we can confer on Wednesday about this and the other issues. But in the meantime, please answer the following questions so we can understand the basis of your request and discuss with our client:

1. Are just VW and Mercedes seeking a stay of their respective cases, or are all Defendants?

2. If the latter, would all Defendants agree that estoppel as to any one defendant applies to all Defendants?
3. Are you requesting an immediate stay, or just preemptively seeking a stay should the remaining IPRs later be instituted?
4. If the former (ie, you're not awaiting all institution decisions), why did you wait until several months after the filing of the initial IPRs to seek a stay?
5. Would Defendants agree to stay the case as to any instituted patents, but continue the case as to those for which an IPR is not instituted?
6. If a stay is imposed, but one of the later IPRs is not instituted, will you agree to lift the stay? If not, what number of patents do you contend must be subject to an instituted IPR to justify an ongoing stay?
7. Are any Defendants intending to file additional IPRs beyond those currently on file?
8. If a stay was imposed, would Defendants agree not to file a future motion to stay or argue for the maintenance of an imposed stay based on the filing or institution of any additional IPRs (by other Defendants or third parties)?
9. If a stay was imposed, would Defendants agree to an expedited discovery and case schedule upon the lifting of the stay?
10. If a stay was imposed, would Defendants agree to submit a joint motion to lift the stay upon receiving Final Written Decisions from the PTO (rather than after the exhaustion of all appeals)?
11. If a stay was imposed, would Defendants agree to forego any 102/103 invalidity defenses in the district court (not just the grounds in the IPR) upon denial of institution? Upon issuance of a Final Written Decision that confirmed one or more claims? Would Defendants agree to at least forego the asserted grounds themselves for any IPR that is not instituted?

Thanks,
Chris

Chris Stewart | Caldwell Cassady Curry PC
214.888.4846

From: Robert Niemeier <RNiemeier@sternekessler.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2023 12:29 PM

To: neowireless@caldwellcc.com

Cc: DL_Nissan-Neo@jenner.com; dla-toyota-neowireless@us.dlapiper.com; FCA-Neo@Venable.com; MercedesNeoWireless@hoganlovells.com; [SERVICE] GM/Neo <SERVICEGMNeo@fr.com>; Service-

Honda/Neo <Service-Honda/Neo@fr.com>; [SERVICE] Tesla/Neo <SERVICETeslaNeo@fr.com>; VW-Neo <VW-Neo@sternekessler.com>; FMCL0315L@brookskushman.com; quadrozzi@youngpc.com

Subject: RE: In Re Neo Wireless - Motion to Stay

Counsel,

In view of the PTAB's institution of Volkswagen's IPR petitions on the '512 patent, the '450 patent and the '941 patent, and Mercedes' petition on the '512 patent, and in view of the additional institution decisions that will be forthcoming on the remaining petitions, Defendants intend to move to stay the MDL pending resolution of the IPR proceedings.

To avoid multiple meet and confers, Defendants would like to discuss this motion during Friday's meet and confer.

Best,
Rob



Robert Niemeier

Director

Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.

1100 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005

Email: rniemeier@sternekessler.com

Direct: 202.772.8634