

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 MOBILEMEDIA IDEAS LLC, et al.,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., et
11 al.,

12 Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-01958-HSG](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IRONWORKS
PATENTS LLC'S MOTION TO
SUBSTITUTE PARTIES AND
COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. No. 66

13 On May 26, 2017, MobileMedia Ideas LLC (“MMI”) filed suit against Samsung
14 Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Samsung”), alleging
15 infringement of the ’078, ’239, and ’125 Patents.¹ Dkt. No. 1 (“Compl”). On March 27, 2017,
16 MMI assigned the patents-in-suit to Ironworks Patents LLC (“Ironworks”). Dkt. No. 66-2.
17 Consequently, Ironworks has filed a motion to substitute parties and counsel, Dkt. No. 66, which
18 is now fully briefed.

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(c) states that “[i]f an interest is transferred, the action
20 may be continued by or against the original party unless the court, on motion, orders the transferee
21 to be substituted in the action or joined with the original party.” The decision of whether to grant
22 a motion to substitute or join a party is left to the “sound discretion” of the district court, weighing
23 whether “the transferee’s presence would facilitate the conduct of the litigation.” In re Bernal,
24 207 F.3d 595, 598 (9th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, “the court, if
25 it sees fit, may allow the transferee to be substituted for the transferor or if it wishes, it may retain
26 the transferor as a party and order that the transferee be made an additional party.” McKesson

27
28 ¹ These patents-in-suit were issued as U.S. Patent Nos. 6,427,078; 5,915,239; and 5,553,125.
Compl. ¶¶ 18, 21, 24.


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

Info. Sols., Inc. v. Bridge Med., Inc., No. CIVS022669 FCD KJM, 2006 WL 658100, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2006). Here, after carefully considering the parties' arguments, the Court finds in its discretion that this litigation will be most fairly and efficiently adjudicated by allowing Ironworks to replace MMI as the plaintiff. Consequently, substituting MMI's counsel with Ironworks' counsel is also clearly appropriate.

For the foregoing reasons, Ironworks' motion for substitution of parties and counsel is **GRANTED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/6/2017


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge