



communications exchanged with third parties regarding Daedalus's attempts to commercialize, enforce, sell, monetize, or license the Asserted Patents. ECF No. 61 at 2. On May 12, 2022, the Court issued an order consolidating the Court's ruling from all of the hearings. ECF No. 61 at 1 (the "Order"). In this Order, with regard to the communications about prospective monetization or licensing of the patents, the Court held that the identity of the parties contacted about a license to the Asserted Patent are discoverable, as are any final consummated agreements that include the Asserted Patents. ECF No. 61 at 4. Additionally, the Court held that communications reflecting negotiations or drafts of unconsummated agreements are not discoverable absent a further showing of good cause. ECF No. 61 at 4.

On May 26, 2022, Microsoft filed an objection to and appeal from the Court's May 12, 2022 Order. ECF No. 64. Microsoft argued that Magistrate Judge Gilliland's Discovery Order, regarding the communications about prospective monetization of licensing of the patents, was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. ECF No. 64 at 1. In addition, Microsoft argued the Discovery Order incorrectly applies a heightened standard of "good cause" for documents and communications reflecting Daedalus's efforts to monetize the Asserted Patents. ECF No. 64 at 2.

## II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

"A magistrate judge's determination regarding a nondispositive matter is reviewed under the 'clearly erroneous or contrary to law' standard." *Baylor Health Care Sys. v. Equitable Plan Serves.*, 955 F. Supp. 2d 678, 689 (N.D. Tex. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

The "clearly erroneous" standard applies to the magistrate judge's findings of fact. *See Baylor Health Care Sys.*, 955 F. Supp. 2d at 689. That standard is a "highly deferential" one; the Court must affirm the Magistrate's decision unless "on the entire evidence [the Court] is left with

a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *Gomez v. Ford Motor Co.*, 2017 WL 5201797, at \*2 (W.D. Tex. April 2017) (quoting *United States v. United States Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948)) (internal quotations omitted). In other words, even were the Court disposed to differ with the Magistrate, such a difference of opinion would not alone entitle it to reverse or reconsider the Order. *Id.* (citing *Guzman v. Hacienda Records & Recording Studio, Inc.*, 808 F.3d 1031, 1036 (5th Cir. 2015)).

On the other hand, a magistrate judge’s legal conclusions are reviewed *de novo* under the less stringent “contrary to law” standard. *See id.*; *Gandee v. Glasser*, 785 F. Supp. 684, 686 (S.D. Ohio 1992), *aff’d*, 19 F.3d 1432 (6th Cir. 1994) (citing 28 U.S.C § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a)); *Fogel v. Chestnutt*, 668 F.2d 100, 116 (2d Cir. 1981), *cert. denied sub nom. Currier v. Fogel*, 459 U.S. 828 (1982).

### III. LEGAL STANDARD

#### A. Relevance of Discovery

Parties are permitted discovery of any non-privileged material relevant to a party’s claim of defense that is proportional to the needs of the case. *See, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1); *Hawkins v. AT&T*, 812 F. App’x 215, 218 (5th Cir. 2020) (“the scope of discovery is broad and permits the discovery of ‘any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense.’”) (quoting *Crosby v. La. Health Serv. & Indem. Co.*, 647 F.3d 258, 262 (5th Cir. 2011)).

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure grant the courts broad discretionary powers. According to Rule 26(b)(2)(C), the court must limit the extent of discovery otherwise allowed by the rules, or by local rule, if it determines that the proposed discovery is outside the scope permitted by Rule 26(b)(1). Furthermore, even when a party shows information is not readily

accessible because of undue burden or cost, the court may nonetheless order discovery from it if the requesting party shows good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

With respect to whether records of unconsummated negotiations should be discoverable, the courts are currently split. Courts have both required and not required parties to produce documents regarding unconsummated negotiations. In *Phoenix Sols. Inc. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, the plaintiff was ordered to produce documents regarding settlement negotiations as relevant to show plaintiff's view of infringement, reasonable royalty, invalidity, and licensing over time. 254 F.R.D. 568, 582–85 (N.D. Cal. 2008). Courts have ordered the production of “ongoing and unconsummated patent licensing communications with third parties in the absence of a consummated agreement” because they are “relevant to whether prior licenses are comparable and to the calculation of a reasonable royalty.” *High Point Sarl v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, No. 09-2269-CM-DJW, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 59529, at \*28–29 (D. Kan. Apr. 30, 2012).

On the other hand, the court in *Mondis Tech., Ltd. V. LG Elecs., Inc.*, found unconsummated settlement negotiation communications not to be discoverable for multiple reasons. No. 2:07-CV-565-TJW-CE, 2011 WL 1714304, at \*5 (E.D. Tex. May 4, 2011). That court and others have subsequently held that “plaintiff’s ‘ongoing or unconsummated settlement and licensing negotiations with the patent-in-suit are not discoverable’ because they are unreliable absent a final decision and may have a chilling effect on ongoing settlement negotiation.” *See, e.g., Sol IP, LLC v. AT&T Mobility, LLC*, No. 2:18-cv-00526-RWS-RSP, 2020 WL 60140, at \*3 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2020) (citing *Mondis*); *Bergstrom, Inc. v. Glacier Bay, Inc.*, No. 08-50078, 2010 WL 257253, at \*2–3 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 22, 2010). In *Hemphill v. San Diego*

*Ass'n of Realtors, Inc.*, the court stated, “discovery of evidence pertaining to settlement negotiations is appropriate only in rare circumstances.” 225 F.R.D. 616, 620 (S.D. Cal. 2005).

#### IV. ANALYSIS

As previously mentioned, to be reversed, rulings on issues of fact must be found “clearly erroneous,” whereas rulings regarding issues of law must be found “contrary to law.” Before the Judge were issues of both fact and law. The issues of fact were whether the unconsummated negotiations were relevant or “unreliable” sources due to their lack of finality, and if they were, whether they were “too burdensome” by way creating a “chilling effect on current negotiations.” There are two issues of law. First, the courts are currently split with respect to whether records of unconsummated negotiations should be discoverable. Second, whether a magistrate judge has the discretion to implement a good cause standard in discovery.

Because the magistrate judge operated within the court’s discretion with respect to the relevance and burden of discovery, and because the courts are currently split with respect to whether records of unconsummated negotiations should be discoverable, this Court cannot find that the magistrate judge’s holding regarding relevance is either “clearly erroneous” or “contrary to law.” In addition, because the magistrate judge has the discretion to implement a good cause standard in discovery, the Court does not find that the magistrate judge’s holding was “contrary to law.”

Microsoft argues the Court should compel Daedalus’s production of the discovery at issue because it is relevant to the value of the patents and damages. ECF No. 64 at 5. Microsoft cites “in [the] absence of [a] consummated agreement,” courts have ordered production of ongoing and unconsummated patent licensing communications with third parties. ECF No. 64 at 6. In the present case, Daedalus has provided one license that arose out of settlement.

# 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.