

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)  
rhatch@linerlaw.com  
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)  
jhaas@linerlaw.com  
3 LINER LLP  
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
4 Los Angeles, California 90024.3518  
Telephone: (310) 500-3500  
5 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc.  
7  
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **WESTERN DIVISION**

12 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California  
corporation,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.,  
16 INC., a California corporation;  
HONDA OF AMERICA MRG, INC.,  
17 an Ohio corporation,

18 Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)  
(Related to 2:14-cv-02962-JAK  
(JEMx); CV14-00497-JAK (JEMx);  
8:14-cv-00491-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-  
02963 JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-02457-  
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03111-JAK  
(JEMx); LA CV14-03109 JAK (JEMx);  
2:14-cv-03107-JAK (JEMx);)

**JOINT STIPULATION FOR  
ENTRY OF PARTIAL FINAL  
JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY**

The Hon. John A. Kronstadt

19 AND RELATED CASES  
20

Trial Date: TBD

21 Plaintiff Signal IP, Inc., (“Plaintiff” or “Signal”) and defendants American Honda  
22 Motor Co., Inc. and Honda of America Mfg., Inc. (collectively “Honda”), Nissan North  
23 America, Inc. (“Nissan”), Mitsubishi Motors North America, Inc. (“Mitsubishi”),  
24 Mazda Motor of America, Inc. (“Mazda”), Subaru of America, Inc. (“Subaru”), Kia  
25 Motors America, Inc. (“KMA”), BMW of North America, LLC (“BMWNA”),  
26 Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (“Mercedes”), and Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. and  
27 Bentley Motors, Inc. (together, “Volkswagen/Bentley”) (collectively, “Defendants”)  
28

Volkswagen v. Signal IP, IPD2015-01088

1 hereby stipulate and agree, subject to the approval of the Court, as follows:

2 1. In 2014, Plaintiff filed suit against Mercedes, Subaru, KMA, Nissan,  
3 Volkswagen/Bentley, BMWNA, and Honda alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No.  
4 6,775,601 (“the ’601 patent”).

5 2. In 2014, Plaintiff filed suit against Mercedes, Mazda, Subaru, KMA,  
6 Nissan, Mitsubishi, Volkswagen/Bentley, BMWNA, and Honda alleging infringement  
7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,007 (“the ’007 patent”).

8 3. In 2014, Plaintiff filed suit against Mazda, KMA, Nissan, Mitsubishi,  
9 Volkswagen/Bentley, BMWNA, and Honda alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No.  
10 5,732,375 (“the ’375 patent”).

11 4. Plaintiff asserted that certain Defendants infringed claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 13,  
12 15, and 17 of the ’601 patent; claims 1 and 7 of the ’375 patent; and claims 1, 8, 9, 17,  
13 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 of the ’007 patent (collectively, the “Asserted Claims”).

14 5. Defendants denied Plaintiff’s claims of infringement and asserted various  
15 affirmative defenses or counterclaims, including that the Asserted Claims were invalid  
16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

17 6. On April 17, 2015, the Court issued its claim construction order (Docket  
18 No. 77) holding, *inter alia*, that (i) certain terms in claims 8, 15, and 17 of the ’601  
19 patent are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2; (ii) certain terms in claims 1,  
20 17, and 20 of the ’007 patent are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2; and (iii)  
21 a term in claim 1 of the ’375 patent is indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2.

22 7. In light of the Court’s claim construction order, Plaintiff and Defendants  
23 stipulate to entry of a partial final judgment that the following claims are invalid due to  
24 indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 2: (i) claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, and 17  
25 of the ’601 patent; (ii) claims 1 and 7 of the ’375 patent; and (iii) claims 1, 8, 9, 17, 18,  
26 19, and 20 of the ’007 patent.

27 8. Plaintiff and Defendants reserve all appellate rights, including, but not  
28 limited to, the right to appeal the Court’s April 17, 2015 claim construction order to the

1 United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Plaintiff reserves all rights as to  
2 claims not addressed by the Court's claim construction order, or any new claims that  
3 may be issued by the United States Patent Office.

4 9. A partial final judgment reflecting the parties' stipulation is submitted  
5 herewith.

6 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

7  
8 Dated: May 20, 2015 LINER LLP

9  
10 By:           /s/ Ryan E. Hatch            
11 Ryan E. Hatch  
12 Jason L. Haas  
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

14  
15 Dated: May 20, 2015 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

16  
17 By:           /s/ Ralph A. Phillips            
18 Ralph A. Phillips (Pro Hac Vice)  
19 Ahmed J. Davis (Pro Hac Vice)  
20 Attorneys for Defendants  
21 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC:  
22 and HONDA OF AMERICA MFG., INC.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Dated: May 20, 2015

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

2  
3  
4 By:           /s/ Patrick A. Lujin          

5 Patrick A. Lujin  
6 B. Trent Webb  
7 Richard D. Eiszner  
8 Gabriel S. Spooner  
9 Douglas W. Robinson  
10 Jamie H. Kitano  
11 Attorneys for Defendant NISSAN NORTH  
12 AMERICA, INC.

13 Dated: May 20, 2015

CHRISTA & JACKSON

14 By:           /s/ Laura K. Christa          

15 Laura K. Christa  
16 Attorneys for Defendant  
17 MITSUBISHI MOTORS NORTH  
18 AMERICA, INC.

19 Dated: May 20, 2015

DLA PIPER, LLP

20  
21 By:           /s/ Matthew D. Satchwell          

22 Matthew D. Satchwell  
23 Clive McClintock  
24 Attorneys for MAZDA MOTOR OF  
25 AMERICA, INC. and SUBARU OF  
26 AMERICA, INC.

1 Dated: May 20, 2015

GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP

2  
3 By:           /s/ Stephen Shahida          

4 Stephen Shahida  
5 Attorneys for Defendant  
6 KIA MOTORS AMERICA, INC.

7 Dated: May 20, 2015

DLA PIPER LLP

8  
9  
10 By:           /s/ Joseph P. Lavelle          

11 Joseph P. Lavelle  
12 Andrew N. Stein  
13 Clive McClintock  
Attorneys for BMW of North America, LLC

14 Dated: May 2020, 2015

GONZALEZ SAGGIO & HARLAN LLP

15  
16  
17 By:           /s/ Don A. Hernandez          

18 Don A. Hernandez  
19 Christina D. Hernandez  
20  
21 FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER &  
22 JACOBSON LLP  
23 Scott W. Doyle (pro hac vice)  
Jonathan DeFosse (pro hac vice)  
Attorneys for Defendant Mercedes-Benz  
USA, LLC

# 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.