

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

CELLCAST TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and)	
ENVISIONIT LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	
)	
THE UNITED STATES,)	No. 15-1307
)	
Defendant,)	Judge Victor J. Wolski
)	
and)	
)	
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES)	
CORPORATION,)	
)	
Third-party Defendant.)	

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
TABLE OF EXHIBITS	v
I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE.....	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
III. DISCUSSION	3
A. RELEVANT LAW	3
1. History of Post-Issuance review of Patents by the U.S. Patent Office.....	3
2. The Power to Stay Proceedings.....	6
B. A DECISION ON INSTITUTION WILL BE MADE BY MAY 7, 2017, AT THE LATEST	6
C. <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW WILL SIMPLIFY ISSUES IN THIS ACTION	8
D. AS THIS CASE IS IN THE INITIAL STAGES, A STAY SHOULD BE GRANTED ...	12
E. A STAY WOULD PRESENT NO DISADVANTAGE OR UNDUE PREJUDICE BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS CAN PURSUE THE SAME REMEDY THEY PRESENTLY SEEK AFTER REVIEW IS COMPLETED.....	13
CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>ASCII Corp. v. STD Entertainment USA, Inc.</i> , 844 F. Supp. 1378 (N.D. Cal. 1994).....	7
<i>Asetek Holdings, Inc v. Cooler Master Co., Ltd.</i> , 2014 WL 1350813 (N.D. Cal. April 3, 2014).....	15
<i>Automatic Mfg. Sys., Inc. v. Primera Tech., Inc.</i> , No. 6:12-CV-1727-ORL-37, 2013 WL 1969247 (M.D. Fla. May 13, 2013).....	6
<i>Bloom Engineering Co., Inc. v. North American Mfg. Co., Inc.</i> , 129 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	9
<i>Boeing Co. v. United States</i> , 86 Fed. Cl. 303 (2009).....	14
<i>CANVS Corp. v. United States</i> , 118 Fed. Cl. 587 (2014).....	6
<i>Cheetah Omni, LLC v. United States</i> , No. 1:11-cv-00255-FMA (Fed. Cl. Jun. 7, 2013).....	8
<i>Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma v. United States</i> , 124 F.3d 1413 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	6
<i>Computer Docking Station Corp. v. Dell, Inc.</i> , 519 F.3d 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	11
<i>Conair Corporation v. Tre Milano, LLC</i> , No. 3:14-cv-1554-AWT, (D. Conn. July 1, 2015).....	6
<i>Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas</i> , 536 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	4
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , No. 15-446, 2016 WL 3369425 (U.S. June 20, 2016).....	5
<i>Dataquill Ltd. v. High Tech Computer Corp.</i> , No. 08-CV-543, 2009 WL 1391537 (S.D. Cal. May 14, 2009).....	14
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 2016 WL 6563342, *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2016).....	12

<i>Fresenius USA, Inc.</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	9, 10
<i>Health Diagnostic Lab., Inc. v. Bos. Heart Diagnostics Corp.</i> , No. 3:14CV796-HEH (E.D. Va. Feb. 4, 2015)	5
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852 (Fed. Cir. 1985)	12
<i>Intellectual Ventures I LLC v. PNC Fin. Servs. Grp., Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 3942277 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 12, 2014)	10
<i>Landis v. North American Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936)	6
<i>Leesona v. United States</i> , 599 F.2d 958 (Ct. Cl. 1979)	14
<i>Moffitt v. Garr</i> , 66 U.S. 273 (1861)	9
<i>Orbital Australia Pty v. Daimler AG</i> , No. 15-CV-12398, 2015 WL 5439774 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 15, 2015)	7
<i>Pleasurecraft Marine Engine Co. v. Indmar Products Co.</i> , 2015 WL 5437181 (D.S.C. Sept. 15, 2015)	7
<i>Pragmatus AV, LLC v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 1922081 (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2014)	11
<i>Procter & Gamble Co. v. Kraft Foods Global</i> , 549 F.3d 842 (Fed. Cir. 2008)	12
<i>Sec. People, Inc. v. Ojmar US, LLC</i> , No. 14-CV-04968-HSG, 2015 WL 3453780 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2015)	7
<i>Semiconductor Energy Lab. Co. v. Chimei Innolux Corp.</i> , No. SACV 12-21-JST JPRX, 2012 WL 7170593 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2012)	6
<i>Spectrum Int'l v. Sterilite Corp.</i> , 164 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 1998)	11
<i>Straight Path IP Group, Inc. v. Vonage Holdings Corp.</i> , No. 14-502, 2014 WL 4271633 (D.N.J. Aug. 28, 2014)	6

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 252..... 10
35 U.S.C. § 311..... 2, 4
35 U.S.C. § 314..... 3, 5
35 U.S.C. § 316..... 15
35 U.S.C. § 318..... 5, 9
Pub. L. No. 96-517, 94 Stat. 3015 3

Rules

157 Cong. Rec. S5319 (daily ed. Sept. 6, 2011) (Statement of Sen. Kyl)..... 4
H.R. Rep. No. 1307 Part I, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. (1980) 3
H.R. Rep. No. 98, 112th Cong., 1st Sess. (2011) 4
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. No. 112-29, 125 Stat. 284 (2011)..... 4

Regulations

37 C.F.R. § 42.107..... 3, 5

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.