

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

**IN RE NEO WIRELESS, LLC  
PATENT LITIGATION**

2:22-MD-03034-TGB

HON. TERRENCE G. BERG

**OPINION AND ORDER  
GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
REDUCE NUMBER OF  
ASSERTED CLAIMS  
(ECF NO. 96)**

THIS MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER RELATES TO ALL  
CASES

The individual cases involved in this MDL matter are for patent infringement brought by Plaintiff Neo Wireless, LLC (“Neo” or “Plaintiff”) against Defendants Ford Motor Company, American Honda Motor Co., Inc., Honda Development & Manufacturing of America, LLC, Volkswagen Group of America, Inc., Volkswagen Group Of America Chattanooga Operations, LLC, Nissan North America, Inc., Nissan Motor Acceptance Corporation a/k/a Nissan Motor Acceptance Company, LLC, Toyota Motor Corporation, Toyota Motor North America, Inc., Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc., Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America, Inc., Toyota Motor Credit Corporation,

General Motors Company, General Motors, LLC, Tesla, Inc., Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC, and FCA US, LLC (collectively “Defendants”). In all nine cases, Neo alleges Defendants infringe six asserted patents related to LTE functionality. “LTE”, which stands for “Long Term Evolution” refers to a technical standard for wireless data transmission.

Presently before the Court is Defendants’ motion to reduce the number of asserted claims. The parties submitted written briefs explaining their positions. ECF Nos. 96, 97, 98. For the reasons stated in this opinion and order, the Court will **GRANT IN PART** and **DENY IN PART** Defendants’ motion to reduce the number of asserted claims.

## I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court held a Scheduling Conference on September 16, 2022. At that conference, the parties presented arguments related to reducing the number of asserted claims. The Court denied Defendants’ request to limit the number of claims at that time, but stated that Defendants could raise the issue of claim reduction if it later became an issue. Defendants have raised the issue by the present motion.

## II. LEGAL STANDARDS

District courts have “the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). In the patent infringement context, “and particularly in multidistrict litigation cases, the district court ‘needs to have broad

discretion to administer the proceeding.” *In re Katz Interactive Call Processing Patent Litig.*, 639 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (quoting *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1232 (9th Cir. 2006)). This includes limiting the number of patent claims for the sake of judicial economy and management of a court’s docket. *Id.*; *Stamps.com Inc. v. Endicia, Inc.*, 437 F. App’x 897, 902 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (limiting the plaintiff to 15 claims across 11 patents having at least four different specifications).

Further, courts in this district have required plaintiffs to limit the number of asserted claims before claim construction. *See, e.g., Genterm Can., Ltd. v. IGB Auto., Ltd.*, No. 13-11536, 2016 WL 1170801, at \*2 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 25, 2016) (ordering plaintiff to limit the number of claims to no more than 14 claims across 7 patents before claim construction); *Joao Control & Monitoring Sys., LLC v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 13-13615, 2014 WL 645246, at \*3 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 19, 2014) (limiting plaintiff to 15 claims across 5 patents before claim construction). These cases indicate that limiting the number of asserted claims to one to three claims per patent would be consistent with the approaches of various district courts.

### III. ARGUMENTS

Defendants argue that Neo represented at the Rule 26(f) conference that it plans to assert only a handful of claims at trial. Defendants contend that it makes no sense for the parties and the Court to expend time and resources litigating the construction of claims that will never be

tried. Defendants further contend that Neo will use the Court's claim construction process as a practice run to test the strength of its case, and will abandon the claims if the Court issues unfavorable claim constructions. According to Defendants, Neo should make an initial reduction of its claims to no more than three asserted claims per patent, for a maximum of 18 claims. Defendants argue that this will allow the Court to prepare these cases for trial and focus the parties on the important issues.

Neo responds that the parties first broached the prospect of narrowing claims and prior art during the Rule 26(f) conference process. Neo contends that Defendants initially proposed a gradual, multi-staged narrowing framework. Pl's. Resp., ECF 97, PageID.7848-49 (citing ECF 97-2).<sup>1</sup> Neo argues that under Defendants' own proposal, the parties would enter claim construction proceedings with forty asserted claims, and only reduce to twenty total claims after claim construction, near the end of fact discovery. Neo states that it objected to that proposal, but agreed to consider mutual narrowing as the case progressed. However, Neo contends that it is in no better position now than it was in September to adequately assess a narrowing framework.

Neo further contends that Defendants' aggressive narrowing proposal is unworkable. Neo argues that only two of the six asserted

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations to the parties' filings are to the filing's number in the docket (ECF No.) and pin cites are to the PageID numbers assigned by the Court's electronic filing system.

patents share a common specification, none contain terminal disclaimers to any other asserted patent, and all six patents cover distinct technology and read on distinct parts of the LTE specifications. Neo further argues that the parties simply do not know all the disputes over infringement and validity, and so could not possibly identify all the unique issues each claim presents.

Neo also argues that Defendants did not comply with Local Rule 7.1(a) meet and confer requirement before filing the present motion. Finally, Neo contends that it is futile to talk about reducing the scope and burden of the case if Defendants remain free to assert an unbounded number of prior art references throughout the case.

Defendants reply that Neo has already previously litigated four of the asserted patents against three other defendants in three other cases—all based on the same infringement contentions it asserts here. Defendants contend that Neo’s infringement contentions are materially identical to the assertions in those cases, and that Neo already has an advanced understanding of its infringement case, the relevant invalidity defenses, and the claims it intends to take to trial.

## IV. ANALYSIS

### A. Reduction of Asserted Claims

“In determining whether to require parties [to] limit the number of claims asserted, courts look to the number of patents and claims at issue and the feasibility of trying the claims to a jury. Courts should also look

# 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.