



Next, the Court **DENIES** Uber's Second Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 193). The Court finds that Uber's Interrogatory Nos. 11 and 12 are overly broad.

Next, the Court **DENIES** Uber's Third Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 194). Based on the briefing, Uber has failed to demonstrate good cause for an additional five hours of deposition time, especially given that Uber has already deposed Mr. Beyer for a total of ten hours.

Next, the Court **DENIES** Uber's Fourth Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 196). The Court finds that AGIS's production of documents within its possession, custody, or control satisfies its discovery obligations.

Finally, the Court **DENIES** AGIS's Motion to Compel Uber to Provide Discovery (Dkt. No. 200). In its motion, AGIS seeks foreign ride information that is routed through servers in the United States. This foreign ride information is not relevant to AGIS's claims of infringement because a process cannot infringe a method patent "unless each of the steps is performed within [the United States]." *NTP, Inc. v. Rsch. In Motion, Ltd.*, 418 F.3d 1282, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Thus, AGIS has failed to demonstrate that the requested information is relevant to its claims of infringement, and therefore the Court denies the motion.

## **II. Motion for Leave and Motion for Partial Summary Judgment**

The Court **DENIES** AGIS' Motion for Leave (Dkt. No. 262) because AGIS has failed to demonstrate good cause. Therefore, AGIS's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 263) is untimely and the Court **DENIES** that motion as well.

**SIGNED this 4th day of January, 2022.**

  
ROY S. PAYNE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE