

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL INC.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 12-355-RGA
	:	
CITIZENS FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL INC.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 13-1812-RGA
	:	
WELLS FARGO BANK N.A.,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL INC.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. 14-91-RGA
	:	
KRONOS INCORPORATED,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL INC., :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 v. : Civil Action No. 14-373-RGA
 :
 CITIGROUP, INC., et al., :
 :
 Defendants. :

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL INC., :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 v. : Civil Action No. 14-495-RGA
 :
 PAYDAY ONE, LLC, et al., :
 :
 Defendants. :

MEMORANDUM ORDER

In five related cases, I have now substituted Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam as Plaintiff.

In each of the cases, there is a motion to expedite decision on all current motions pending in above cases. (No. 12-355-RGA, D.I. 119; 13-1812-RGA, D.I. 38; No. 14-91-RGA, D.I. 47; No. 14-373-RGA, D.I. 39; No. 14-495-RGA, D.I. 35).¹

Pi-Net filed No. 12-355 on March 19, 2012, asserting the ‘500, ‘158, and ‘492 patents against Citizens Financial Group, Inc. On June 21, 2013, I stayed the case in light of pending CBM review of the three asserted patents. (D.I. 82). The case remains stayed. Pi-Net filed No. 13-1812 on November 1, 2013, asserting the ‘500 and ‘492 patents against Wells Fargo &

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, docket item citations are to the record in No. 12-355.

Company. About the time I might have held a scheduling conference, Judge Robinson decided on May 14, 2014, in *Pi-Net v. J. P. Morgan*, No. 12-282-SLR, that the '500, '158, and '492 patent claims were invalid. (No. 12-282-SLR, D.I. 165 & 166). There has thus been no substantive progress in the No. 13-1812 case, although it has not been formally stayed. In No. 14-91, Pi-Net filed a case on January 22, 2014, against Kronos Inc., asserting the '500, '492, '833, and '894 patents. While preliminary motions were pending, the parties stipulated to a stay pending resolution of the appeal from the *J.P. Morgan* case. (No. 14-91-RGA, D.I. 14). I granted the stay. In No. 14-373, Pi-Net filed suit against Citigroup, Inc. on March 24, 2014, asserting the '500 and '492 patents. On June 17, 2014, the parties agreed to stay the case, which I granted. (No. 14-373-RGA, D.I. 9). In No. 14-495, on April 18, 2014, Pi-Net filed suit against Payday One LLC, asserting the '500, '492, and '894 patents. Defendant has answered the complaint, but there has been no further substantive progress on the case.

I do not believe that there are now any pending motions that need to be decided. As noted above, three of the cases have been stayed. (Nos. 12-355-RGA, 14-91-RGA, and 14-373-RGA). Four of the five asserted patents have had their claims either ruled invalid or are subject to review in the PTO. The fifth patent is only asserted in the *Kronos* case, which has already been stayed. Thus, I will *sua sponte* STAY the 13-1812 and 14-495 cases. The pending *J. P. Morgan* appeal and the PTO actions are likely to result in simplification. All of these cases are in the preliminary stages. There is no unfair prejudice to Plaintiff, who as far as I know is not a competitor with any of the Defendants.

The motions to expedite (No. 12-355-RGA, D.I. 119; 13-1812-RGA, D.I. 38; No. 14-91-

RGA, D.I. 47; No. 14-373-RGA, D.I. 39; No. 14-495-RGA, D.I. 35) are **DENIED**. Any party may move to lift the stay (or partially lift the stay) once the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has decided the *J. P. Morgan* appeal.

Wilmington, Delaware
March 19, 2015


United States District Judge