

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD	1
A. Motion to Compel	1
B. Motion to Stay	2
III. ARGUMENT	3
A. Defendant’s Motion to Compel Must be Denied.....	3
B. Defendant’s Renewed Motion to Stay Must be Denied.....	6
IV. CONCLUSION	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Beattie v. Madison County Sch. Dist.</i> , 254 F.3d 595 (5th Cir. 2001)	2
<i>Clinton v. Jones</i> , 520 U.S. 681 (1997)	2
<i>EchoStar Techs. Corp. v. TiVo, Inc.</i> , No. 5:05-cv-81, 2006 WL 2501494 (E.D. Tex. July 14, 2006)	3
<i>GeoTag, Inc. v. Frontier Commn’s Corp.</i> , No. 2:10-cv-265-JRG, 2013 WL 12141427 (E.D. Tex. June 26, 2013)	1, 2
<i>Herbert v. Lando</i> , 441 U.S. 153 (1979)	1
<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936)	2
<i>Lodsys v. Brother Int’l Corp.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-90, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51336 (E.D. Tex. Jan 14, 2013)	3
<i>Realtime Data, LLC v. Hewlett Packard Enter. Co.</i> , No. 6:16-cv-00086-RWS-JDL, 2017 WL 3712916 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 3, 2017)	3
<i>Soverain Software LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 356 F. Supp. 2d 660 (E.D. Tex. 2005)	2
<i>Team Worldwide Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , No. 2:17-cv-000235-JRG, 2018 WL 2722051 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2018)	2
<i>UltimatePointer, L.L.C. v. Nintendo Co.</i> , No. 6:11-cv-496-LED, 2014 WL 12515338 (E.D. Tex. June 17, 2014)	3

Plaintiff AGIS Software Development LLC (“AGIS” or “Plaintiff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby submits this response in opposition to Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc., d/b/a Uber’s (“Uber” or “Defendant”) Opposed Motion to Compel and Renewed Motion to Stay (Dkt. 117) (the “Motion”).

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendant asks this Court to compel AGIS to produce documents related to its motion to stay and renews its motion to stay. As a preliminary matter, the parties are not at an impasse regarding ongoing discovery and Defendant’s Motion is unnecessary and premature. AGIS has produced documents and supplemented its interrogatory response in accordance with Defendant’s requests and continues to conduct discovery related to this matter. Moreover, AGIS maintains that Defendant’s arguments regarding standing are unfounded.

Second, this Court has already denied Defendant’s motion to stay until “resolution of an alleged standing issue.” Dkt. 85 at 3. As the Court noted in its order, “there are still two other patents asserted against Uber as well as several other defendants with other patents issued against them.” *Id.* These circumstances have not changed such that Defendant’s renewed motion is warranted and no additional facts affect the Court’s decision at this point.

Accordingly, AGIS respectfully requests that the Court deny Defendant’s Motion to Compel and Renewed Motion to Stay.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A. Motion to Compel

The rules of discovery are “accorded a broad and liberal application to affect their purpose of adequately informing litigants in civil trials.” *GeoTag, Inc. v. Frontier Commn’s Corp.*, No. 2:10-cv-265-JRG, 2013 WL 12141427, at *1 (E.D. Tex. June 26, 2013) (citing *Herbert v. Lando*,

441 U.S. 153, 176 (1979)). “A district court has broad discretion in all discovery matters.” *Id.* (citing *Beattie v. Madison County Sch. Dist.*, 254 F.3d 595, 606 (5th Cir. 2001)).

In this Court, “a request for court intervention is not appropriate until the participants have met and conferred, in good faith, and concluded, in good faith, that the discussions have conclusively ended in an impasse, leaving an open issue for the court to resolve.” Local Rule CV-7(h). “Good faith requires honesty in one’s purpose to discuss meaningfully the dispute, freedom from intention to defraud or abuse the discovery process and faithfulness to one’s obligation to secure information without court intervention.” *Id.* In addition, this Court requires that any discovery-related motion be preceded by a joint report “of no more than 2 pages” which “shall be filed by the earlier of 48 hours following that meeting or 24 hours before said hearing.” Standing Order Regarding “Meet and Confer” Obligations Relating to Discovery Disputes.

B. Motion to Stay

“The district court has the inherent power to control its own docket, including the power to stay proceedings.” *Soverain Software LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 356 F. Supp. 2d 660, 662 (E.D. Tex. 2005) (citing *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)); see *Team Worldwide Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. 2:17-cv-000235-JRG, 2018 WL 2722051, at *2 (E.D. Tex. June 6, 2018) (citing *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997)) (“Absent some overwhelming legal requirement or showing of manifest injustice, this Court will not intervene in a district court’s management of its calendar or scheduling of events in a matter before that court.”). Management of the court’s docket requires “the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.” *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254-55.

Courts typically consider three things when deciding whether to stay litigation: “(1) whether a stay will unduly prejudice or present a clear tactical disadvantage to the non-moving party; (2) whether a stay will simplify issues in question and trial of the case; and

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.