

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

ECOBEE, INC.,)
)
Plaintiff,) C.A. No. 21-323-MN
)
v.) **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
)
ECOFACOR, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

ECOBEE, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STAY

OF COUNSEL:

Timothy Carroll
Steven Lubezny
VENABLE LLP
227 West Monroe Street, Suite 3950
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (312) 820-3400

Manny J. Caixeiro
VENABLE LLP
2049 Century Park E, Ste. 2300
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 229-9900

Dated: July 13, 2021
7294695 / 51061

David E. Moore (#3983)
Bindu A. Palapura (#5370)
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor
1313 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Tel: (302) 984-6000
dmoore@potteranderson.com
bpalapura@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ecobee, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 2

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

ARGUMENT 4

 I. The Mandatory Stay Provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1659 Are Inapplicable 4

 II. The Court Should Decline to Enter a Discretionary Stay 5

CONCLUSION..... 10

TABLE OF CITATIONS

| | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| Cases | |
| <i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. ATI Technologies ULC</i> , C.A. No. 19-70-CFC, 2019 WL 4082836 (D. Del. Aug. 29, 2019) | 10 |
| <i>Aliphcom v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 154 F. Supp. 933 (N.D. Cal.) | 9 |
| <i>Elan Microelectronics Corp. v. Apple Inc.</i> , C 90-1531, 2010 WL 11719115 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2010) | 4, 9 |
| <i>Energetiq Tech. v. AMSL Netherlands B.V.</i> , 15-cv-10240, 2016 WL 11727302 (D. Mass. Apr. 1, 2016) | 4, 8 |
| <i>In re Princo</i> , 468 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2007) | 9 |
| Statutes | |
| 19 U.S.C. § 1337 | 1 |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1659 | 2, 4, 8, 9 |
| 35 U.S.C. § 101 | 9 |

NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS

This case is part of a large-scale patent assertion campaign, in which defendant/counterclaim plaintiff EcoFactor, Inc. (“EcoFactor”) is alleging that plaintiff/counterclaim defendant ecobee, Inc. (“ecobee”) infringes patents relating to certain smart thermostat technologies. The campaign includes: (1) International Trade Commission (“ITC”) Investigation No. 337-TA-1185 (the “First ITC Action”) against ecobee and other participants in the smart thermostat market, instituted in November 2019, which to date has resulted in an initial determination by the Administrative Law Judge that no violation of 19 U.S.C. § 1337 has occurred, that ecobee is not infringing the patents in issue in the First ITC Action (which are different from the patents in issue in the instant case), that claims asserted against ecobee are invalid, and that EcoFactor does not satisfy § 1337’s domestic industry requirement;¹ (2) a District Court action filed in the District of Massachusetts (*EcoFactor, Inc. v. ecobee, Inc.*, 19-cv-12325 (D. Mass.)); (3) a District Court action filed in the Western District of Texas (*EcoFactor, Inc. v. ecobee, Inc.*, 20-cv-00078 (W.D. Tex.)), (4) a second District Court action filed in the Western District of Texas (*EcoFactor, Inc. v. ecobee, Inc.*, 21-cv-00428 (W.D. Tex.)), which involves certain patents that are family members of patents in issue in this lawsuit, and (5) a second ITC action (ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-1258, complaint filed in February 2021, the “Second ITC Action”), which involves allegations that ecobee is infringing the same patents as those in issue in this case.

The instant case was commenced by ecobee on March 2, 2021. ecobee seeks declaratory judgments that it does not infringe four patents that EcoFactor contends to be infringed by

¹ The public version of the Administrative Law Judge’s Initial Determination is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

ecobee: U.S. Patent Nos. 8,019,567; 10,612,983; 8,596,550; 8,886,488 (collectively, the “Patents in Suit”). *See* D.I. 1.

On May 5, 2021, EcoFactor filed an answer and counterclaims, in which it alleges that ecobee is infringing the Patents in Suit. *See* D.I. 9.

On May 26, 2021, ecobee filed an answer to EcoFactor’s counterclaims, which included, among other things, defenses that the Patents in Suit are invalid. *See* D.I. 10.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. 28 U.S.C. § 1659 does not require that the instant case be stayed. The mandatory stay provisions of that statute only apply if the *respondent* in an ITC investigation (i.e., ecobee) asks the District Court to stay a litigation—which has not occurred.

2. The Court should not enter a discretionary stay because there is no simplification or efficiency to be gained by entering a stay. As EcoFactor itself notes, the ITC’s rulings are not binding on the District Court. While EcoFactor contends that a stay would allow this Court to receive the “benefits” of rulings and events in the Second ITC Action, that is true regardless of whether the Court enters a stay because under the parties’ stipulated schedule (D.I. 14) the most important events in this case will occur well after the corresponding events in the Second ITC Action. Moreover, the parties can work together to create efficiencies and avoid duplication in discovery and other matters.

3. A stay will only delay the proceedings and create prejudice. Waiting several years to adjudicate this case is unnecessary, and creates a risk that witnesses (including ecobee’s Canada-based employees) will become unavailable, memories will fade, and evidence will become more difficult to collect. In contrast, EcoFactor—which has been prolific in its litigation campaign, and has not sought to stay other actions concerning related patents—would suffer no prejudice if the Court denies the instant motion.

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.