

United States District Court
For the 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

CAPELLA PHOTONICS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., *et al.*
Defendants.

No. C-14-3348 EMC
CONSOLIDATED CASES
C-14-3349 EMC
C-14-3350 EMC
C-14-3351 EMC

**ORDER REGARDING CISCO'S
PENDING MOTION FOR LITIGATION
STAY PENDING *INTER PARTES*
REVIEW**

On February 12, 2015, Cisco filed a motion to stay this action pending the Patent and Trademark Office's decision to institute *inter partes review* (IPR) of one of the patents-in-suit.¹ Docket No. 161. Cisco also filed a motion to expedite the briefing schedule on its motion to stay. Docket No. 162, which this Court granted. Docket No. 163. Cisco's reply in support of its motion to stay is currently due this Friday, March 6, and a hearing is scheduled for Thursday, March 12. *Id.*

In Capella's opposition to Cisco's motion to stay, Capella states that the non-Cisco defendants have not taken a concrete position on whether the pending cases against them should be stayed pending the resolution of IPR proceedings if the case against Cisco is stayed. Docket No. 167. Capella also contends that the non-Cisco defendants have not taken a firm position on Capella's offer to stipulate to a stay of all of the consolidated proceedings before this Court in


¹ The PTO has since instituted IPR of the other patent-in-suit. *See* Docket No. 164.

1 exchange for the non-Cisco defendants agreeing to be bound by the outcome of Cisco's IPR petition,
2 consistent with the estoppel provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 315(e)(2).

3 Non-Cisco defendants are hereby **ORDERED** to file a notice before **noon** on **Thursday,**
4 **March 5, 2015**, indicating: (1) whether they seek a stay of their own cases pending resolution of
5 Cisco's IPR; and (2) whether they will agree to be bound by the same estoppel that limits IPR
6 petitioners as set forth by 35 U.S.C. § 315(e) if the Court conditions a stay in this case on such
7 agreement. The notice shall not contain argument and shall not exceed one page in length.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: March 3, 2015

11
12 
13 EDWARD M. CHEN
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28