

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

BLITZSAFE TEXAS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF AMERICA,
INC. and VOLKSWAGEN GROUP OF
AMERICA CHATTANOOGA
OPERATIONS, LLC,**

Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-01278-JRG-RSP

CONSOLIDATED INTO

No. 2:15-cv-01274-JRG-RSP

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
A. Plaintiff Blitzsafe	2
B. The Stage Of These Litigations	3
C. The Toyota, VWGoA, Honda, and Hyundai/Kia IPR Proceedings.....	4
LEGAL STANDARD.....	5
ARGUMENT.....	6
A. Granting A Stay Will Not Unduly Prejudice Or Tactically Disadvantage Blitzsafe, But Will Instead Benefit Both Parties	7
B. A Stay Is Highly Likely To Simplify The Issues For Trial Because Almost Two-Thirds Of The Asserted Patent Claims Will Be Reviewed By The Patent Office And Are Likely To Be Found Invalid In The IPR Proceedings	9
C. The Stage Of The Litigation Favors Granting A Stay Because, Although Fact Discovery Is Already Underway, Expert Discovery, Dispositive Motions, And Trial Preparation Have Not Yet Begun	13
CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> , 239 F.3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	11
<i>B & B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 135 S.Ct. 1293 (2015).....	11
<i>Crossroads Sys., Inc. v. Dot Hill Sys. Corp.</i> , No. A-13-CA-1025-SS, 2015 WL 3773014 (W.D. Tex. June 16, 2015)	7
<i>e2Interactive, Inc. v. Blackhawk Network, Inc.</i> , 561 Fed. Appx. 895 (Fed. Cir. 2014).....	11
<i>EchoStar Techs. Corp. v. TiVo, Inc.</i> , No. 5-05 CV 81 DF, 2006 WL 2501494 (E.D. Tex. July 14, 2006).....	13, 14
<i>Emed Techs. Corp. v. Repro-med Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 2:15-CV-1167-JRG-RSP, 2016 WL 2758112 (E.D. Tex. May 12, 2016).....	5
<i>Employment Law Compliance, Inc. v. Compli, Inc.</i> , No. 3:13-CV-3574-N, 2014 WL 3739770 (N.D. Tex. May 27, 2014).....	7
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. TCL Commc'n Tech. Holdings, Ltd.</i> , No. 2:15-cv-00011-RSP, 2016 WL 1162162 (E.D. Tex. March 23, 2016).....	passim
<i>e-Watch, Inc. v. ACTi Corp., Inc.</i> , No. SA-12-CA-695-FB, 2013 WL 6334372 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 9, 2013)	7
<i>E-Watch, Inc. v. Lorex Canada, Inc.</i> , No. H-12-3314, 2013 WL 5425298 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2013)	7, 10
<i>Flexiteek Am., Inc. v. PlasTEAK, Inc.</i> , No. 08-60996-CIV, 2012 WL 5364247 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 31, 2012)	10
<i>Flexiteek Am., Inc. v. PlasTEAK, Inc.</i> , No. 08-60996-CIV, 2012 WL 5364263 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 10, 2012).....	10
<i>Fresenius USA, Inc. v. Baxter Int'l</i> , 721 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	10
<i>Gould v. Control Laser Corp.</i> , 705 F.2d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	5, 6

Krippelz v. Ford Motor Co.,
667 F.3d 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2012)..... 11

Marlowe Pat. Holdings LLC v. Dice Elecs. LLC, et al.,
Case No. 3:10-cv-01199-PGS-DEA (D.N.J.) 3

Marlowe Pat. Holdings LLC v. Ford Motor Co.,
Case No. 3:11-cv-07044-PGS-DEA (D.N.J.) 3

NFC Tech. LLC v. HTC Am., Inc.,
No. 2:13-CV-1058-WCB, 2015 WL 1069111 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2015)..... passim

Translogic Tech., Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd.,
250 Fed. Appx. 988 (Fed. Cir. 2007)..... 10

Transocean Offshore Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Seadrill Am., Inc.,
No. CIV.A. H-15-144, 2015 WL 6394436 (S.D. Tex. Oct. 22, 2015) 8

VirtualAgility, Inc. v. Salesforce.com, Inc.,
759 F.3d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2014)..... 5, 6, 9

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 313..... 5

35 U.S.C. § 314..... 5

35 U.S.C. § 315..... 12

35 U.S.C. § 316..... 8

Rules

E.D. Tex. P.R. 3-1..... 3

INTRODUCTION

In this litigation and in the consolidated lawsuits, plaintiff (“Blitzsafe”) is asserting claims for infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,489,786 and 8,155,342 against defendants Volkswagen Group of America, Inc., Volkswagen Group of America Chattanooga Operations, LLC (“VWGoA and VWGoA Chattanooga”) and defendants Honda, Hyundai/Kia, Nissan, and Toyota. *See, e.g.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-01278-JRG-RSP, D.E. 22 (Blitzsafe’s First Amended Complaint against VWGoA and VWGoA Chattanooga).¹ The U.S. Patent Office Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB” or “Board”) recently instituted two *inter partes* reviews of the ’786 and ’342 patents requested by Toyota, after finding that almost 60% of Blitzsafe’s asserted patent claims—41 of 69—are not reasonably likely to be patentable over the prior art.² VWGoA also recently filed three IPR petitions, and Honda and Hyundai/Kia recently filed four additional IPR petitions, challenging the remaining asserted claims, as well as the claims already under review, on additional grounds that have not yet been considered by the Board.³

The court should stay this litigation until the conclusion of these IPR proceedings, including any appeals. Each of the relevant factors favors a stay. First, Blitzsafe will not be unduly prejudiced by a stay because it does not compete with VWGoA and VWGoA Chattanooga, and money damages will be adequate to compensate it for any delay. Second, a

¹ The ’342 patent claims the priority of the ’786 patent through a chain of a continuation-in-part patent applications. In its P.R. 3-1 infringement contentions, Blitzsafe asserts that VWGoA and VWGoA Chattanooga infringe claims 1–2, 4–8, 13–14, 23–24, 44, 47, 57–58, 60–65, 86, 88–92, 94, 97, and 98 of the ’786 patent, and claims 49–54, 56, 62–64, 71, 73–78, 95, 97, 99–101, 106, 109–11, and 120 of the ’342 patent. *See* Ex. 1 (Blitzsafe infringement contentions) at 2.

² *See* Exs. 2–3 (Institution Decisions in IPR2016-00418 and IPR2016-00421).

³ *See* Exs. 4–6 (VWGoA Petitions in IPR2016-01445, IPR2016-01448 and IPR2016-01449, filed July 20, 2016); Exs. 7–8 (Honda Petitions in IPR2016-01472 and IPR2016-01473, filed July 21, 2016); Exs. 9–10 (Hyundai/Kia Petitions in IPR2016-01476 and IPR2016-01477, filed July 21, 2016).

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.