

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

VELOCITY PATENT LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AUDI OF AMERICA, INC.

Defendant.

Case No: 1:13-cv-8418

Honorable John W. Darrah

Magistrate Judge Michael T. Mason

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO STAY THE
PROCEEDINGS PENDING REEXAMINATION OF THE PATENT-IN-SUIT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

TABLE OF EXHIBITS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 2

 A. Plaintiff Velocity..... 2

 B. The '781 Patent-In-Suit..... 2

 C. Reexamination Of The '781 Patent..... 3

LEGAL STANDARD..... 4

ARGUMENT 5

 A. Granting A Stay Of This Litigation Will Not Unduly Prejudice Or Tactically
 Disadvantage Velocity, But Will Benefit Both The Parties And The Court 5

 B. The Reexamination Of The '781 Patent Is Very Likely To Resolve This Lawsuit
 Or At Least Simplify The Issues For Trial 8

 C. Because This Lawsuit Is In Its Preliminary Stages, A Stay Is Very Likely To
 Reduce The Burden Of Litigation On Both The Parties And The Court..... 10

CONCLUSION..... 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Cases	
<i>Allied Machine & Engineering Corp. v. Competitive Carbide, Inc.</i> , No. 1:11CV2712, 2013 WL 5566158 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 8, 2013).....	6, 7
<i>Arrivalstar S.S. v. Canadian Nat. Ry. Co.</i> , No. 08 c 1086, 2008 WL 2940807 (N.D. Ill. July 25, 2008).....	8, 9, 10
<i>Black & Decker Inc. v. Positec USA, Inc.</i> , No. 13 C 3075, 2013 WL 5718460 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 1, 2013).....	5, 7, 8, 10
<i>Brixham Solutions Ltd. v. Juniper Networks, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-00616-JCS, 2014 WL 1677991 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2014).....	7
<i>Cascades Computer Innovation, LLC v. SK hynix Inc.</i> , No. 11 C 4356, 2012 WL 2086469 (N.D. Ill. May 25, 2012)	5, 6, 9
<i>CIVIX v. National Ass’n of Realtors</i> , No. 05 C 6869, 2007 WL 7759150 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 17, 2007).....	4
<i>Emhart Indus., Inc. v. Sankyo Seiki Mfg. Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 85 C 7565, 1987 WL 6314 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 2, 1987).....	4, 10
<i>Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , Nos. C 13-4202 SI, -4204 SI, 2014 WL 261837 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2014)	7
<i>Flexiteek Americas, Inc. v. PlasTEAK, Inc.</i> , No. 08-60996-CIV, 2012 WL 5364247 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2012)	11
<i>Flexiteek Americas, Inc. v. PlasTEAK, Inc.</i> , No. 08-60996-CIV, 2012 WL 5364263 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 10, 2012).....	11
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int’l</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	9, 10
<i>Genzyme Corp. v. Cobrek Pharm., Inc.</i> , No. 10 CV 112, 2011 WL 686807 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 17, 2011).....	7, 8
<i>Global Patent Holdings, LLC v. Green Bay Packers, Inc.</i> , No. 00 C 4623, 2008 WL 1848142 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 23, 2008).....	4, 9, 10
<i>Gould v. Control Laser Corp.</i> , 705 F.2d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	4, 10
<i>Hamilton Indus., Inc. v. Midwest Folding Prods. Mfg. Corp.</i> , No. 89 C 8696, 1990 WL 37642 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 20, 1990)	4

<i>Ignite USA, LLC v. Pacific Market International, LLC</i> , No. 1:14-cv-00856, 2014 WL 2505166 (N.D. Ill. May 29, 2014)	5, 6, 7
<i>Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Commerce Bancshares, Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-04160-NKL, 2014 WL 2511308 (W.D. Mo. June 4, 2014)	7
<i>JAB Distributors, LLC v. London Luxury, LLC</i> , No. 09 C 5831, 2010 WL 1882010 (N.D. Ill. May 11, 2010)	passim
<i>Krippelz v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 667 F.3d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	9, 10
<i>Landis v. North American Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936).....	4
<i>Lincoln Nat. Life Ins. Co. v. Transamerica Financial Life Ins. Co.</i> , No. 1:08-CV-135-JVB-RBC, 2009 WL 1108822 (N.D. Ind. Apr. 24, 2009)	7, 9, 10, 11
<i>Marine Polymer Techs., Inc. v. Hemcon, Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 1084 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	9
<i>Marine Polymer Techs., Inc. v. Hemcon, Inc.</i> , 672 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	9
<i>Pactool Intern. Ltd. v. Dewalt Indus. Tool Co.</i> , No. C06-5367BHS, 2008 WL 312677 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 1, 2008)	7
<i>Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , No. 11-CV-02168-EJD, 2011 WL 4802958 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2011)	7
<i>Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Kraft Foods Global, Inc.</i> , 549 F.3d 842 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	9
<i>Progressive Cas. Ins. Co. v. Safeco Ins. Co.</i> , No. 1:10 CV 1370, 2010 WL 4699870 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 12, 2010)	7, 9
<i>Radio Sys. Corp. v. E. Mishan & Sons, Inc.</i> , No. 3:13-CV-383, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65975 (E.D. Tenn. Mar. 28, 2014)	6
<i>Seaquist Closures LLC v. Rexam Plastics</i> , No. 08C0106, 2008 WL 4691792 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 22, 2008).....	6, 7
<i>Southwall Techs., Inc. v. Cardinal IG Co.</i> , 54 F.3d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995).....	10
<i>SP Techs., LLC v. HTC Corp.</i> , No. 08 C 3760, 2009 WL 1285933 (N.D. Ill. May 6, 2009)	6, 7

Translogic Tech., Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd.,
250 Fed. Appx. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 11

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 305..... 5

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 May 22, 2014 Request for *Ex Parte* Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 5,954,781 Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.510 (without exhibits)

Exhibit 2 June 27, 2014 Decision Granting *Ex Parte* Reexamination

Exhibit 3 United States Patent and Trademark Office, Statistical Data, Central Reexamination Unit (CRU), *Ex Parte (EP)* and *Inter Partes (IP)* Proceedings, Fiscal Years 2012–2013

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.