

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DROPLETS, INC., Plaintiff, v. YAHOO! INC., Defendant.	Case No. 12-cv-03733-JST ORDER CONTINUING STAY Re: ECF No. 294
DROPLETS, INC., Plaintiff, v. NORDSTROM, INC., Defendant.	Case No. 12-cv-4049-JST

On September 13, 2013, the Court stayed these cases pending inter partes reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 7,502,838 (“the ’838 patent”). ECF No. 275.¹ The Court has continued the stay several times, most recently on January 4, 2016. ECF No. 88. On April 5, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Notice Regarding Reexamination Appeal, notifying “the Court that an order issued in the inter partes reexamination appeal for U.S. Patent No. 7,502,838. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board sustained the Examiner’s rejection of all 38 claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,502,838.” ECF No. 292. Plaintiff also noted that it “plans to appeal the decision.” *Id.*

On April 12, 2016, the Court ordered the parties to show cause why these cases should not remain stayed. ECF No. 293. That same day, Plaintiff filed a response to the order to show cause, stating: “To best conserve the resources of the parties and the Court, Droplets believes that the

¹ All ECF citations refer to the ECF docket in Droplets, Inc. v. Yahoo! Inc., No. 12-cv-3733-JST (filed Sept. 7, 2011).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

continuance of the stay is warranted in this case.” ECF No. 294. Defendants did not respond to the order to show cause.

In light of Plaintiff’s response, the Court finds good cause to continue the stay in this case until October 21, 2016. In the event that a decision issues on Plaintiff’s appeal, Plaintiff is ordered to file a notice informing the Court of the decision within 7 days.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 21, 2016



JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge