

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

VARTA MICROBATTERY GMBH,

Plaintiff,

v.

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION

C.A. No. 2:20-cv-0051-JRG

LEAD CASE

BEST BUY CO., INC, ET AL

C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00054-JRG

PEAG, LLC

C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00071-JRG

AUDIO PARTNERSHIP LLC, ET AL

C.A. No. 2:20-cv-00138-JRG

**DEFENDANTS PEAG, LLC D/B/A JLAB AUDIO, AUDIO PARTNERSHIP LLC AND
AUDIO PARTNERSHIP PLC D/B/A CAMBRIDGE AUDIO'S
OPPOSED MOTION TO STAY PENDING *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
IN CASE NOS. 2:20-CV-00071 AND 2:20-CV-00138**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS..... 2

II. LEGAL STANDARD 3

III. ARGUMENT..... 4

A. A Stay Will Significantly Simplify or Eliminate Issues in This Litigation 4

B. VARTA Will Not Suffer Undue Prejudice from a Stay 5

C. The Stage of the Case Weighs in Favor of a Stay..... 6

CONCLUSION 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
 Cases	
<i>Aylus Networks, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	5
<i>Customedia Techs. v. Dish Network Corp.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-129, Dkt. No. 187, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2017).....	3
<i>Cywee Grp. Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 2:17-CV-140, Dkt. No. 331, slip op. (E.D. Tex. Feb. 14, 2019)	6, 7
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc’n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-00011, 2016 WL 1162162 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 23, 2016)	3
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 139 F. Supp. 3d 1032 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	4
<i>Intellectual Ventures II LLC v. Bitco General Ins. Corp.</i> , No. 6:15-CV-59, 2016 WL 4394485 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....	4
<i>NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-1058, 2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015)	3, 4, 5, 6
<i>Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. TP-Link Techs., Co.</i> , Case No. 6:13-CV-384, 2014 WL 5035718 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2014)	7
<i>Uniloc USA, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:16-CV-642, 2017 WL 9885168 (E.D. Tex. June 13, 2017).....	4, 5
<i>VirtualAgility v. Salesforce.com</i> , 759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	5, 6, 7
<i>Wi-LAN, Inc. v. LG Elecs., Inc.</i> , No. 3:17-CV-358, 2018 WL 2392161 (S.D. Cal. May 22, 2018)	4
 Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11).....	3
 Other Authorities	
<i>Changes to Implement Inter Partes Review Proceedings, Post-Grant Review Proceedings, and Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents</i> , 77 Fed. Reg. 48680–81 (Aug.14, 2012) (to be codified at 37 C.F.R. pt. 42).....	6

INTRODUCTION

Defendants PEAG, LLC d/b/a JLab Audio (“JLab”), Audio Partnership LLC and Audio Partnership PLC d/b/a Cambridge Audio (“Cambridge”) (collectively “Defendants”) respectfully move the Court to stay Case Nos. 2:20-cv-00071 and 2:20-cv-00138 until the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) has concluded *inter partes* review (“IPR”) of all four patents asserted in these cases: U.S. Patent Nos. 9,153,835; 9,496,581; 9,799,858; and 9,799,913 (collectively, the “Asserted Patents”).

Defendants diligently filed four IPR petitions with the PTAB seeking review of the Asserted Patents on July 7, 2020, less than two months after Plaintiff VARTA Microbattery GmbH (“VARTA”) disclosed the asserted claims in its infringement contentions. Defendants’ IPR petitions challenge the patentability of all of the asserted claims and others, citing prior art combinations that the United States Patent and Trademark Office did not consider during prosecution.

Resolution of the pending IPRs will significantly narrow the scope of the present litigation, or altogether render it moot. Additionally, VARTA’s statements in these IPR proceedings will be relevant to issues here, including issues of claim construction, which process has not yet begun in this case.

Defendants bring this motion now when the factors this Court considers—the simplification of pending issues, state of the proceedings, and risk of undue prejudice to the plaintiff—all weigh in favor of a granting a stay.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

VARTA filed complaints against JLab and Cambridge in the Eastern District of Texas on March 4, 2020 and May 4, 2020¹, respectively, asserting infringement of four patents. On May 12, 2020, VARTA served infringement contentions on Defendants and identified the patent claims it contends Defendants infringe. Less than two months after receiving VARTA's infringement contentions, Defendants filed IPR petitions, seeking to invalidate each asserted claim of each Asserted Patent. Those four IPR petitions also address certain claims that have not been asserted in litigation:

IPR Case No.	Patent	Challenged Claims	Actual Filing Date	Notice of Filing Date Accorded	Institution Decision Deadline
IPR2020-1211	'581	1-12	July 7, 2020	July 22, 2020	January 7, 2021
IPR2020-1212	'835	1-12	July 7, 2020	July 22, 2020	January 7, 2021
IPR2020-1213	'858	1-8	July 7, 2020	August 6, 2020	January 7, 2021
IPR2020-1214	'913	1-8	July 7, 2020	August 6, 2020	January 7, 2021

The actual and accorded filing date for Defendants' petitions is July 7, 2020. VARTA has three months from the notice of filing date to file a preliminary response to each petition. The PTAB is set to issue institution decisions on Defendants' petitions in less than six months, i.e., on

¹ VARTA filed a complaint against Cambridge in the Northern District of Illinois on March 3, 2020 (Case No. 1:20-cv-01568). That complaint was voluntarily dismissed and refiled in this District on May 4, 2020.

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.