# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION 

ONE NUMBER CORPORATION, Plaintiff, )
vs.
GOOGLE, INC.,
Defendant.

1:10-cv-312-RLY-TAB

## ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY

Defendant moved to stay this case pending the Patent \& Trademark Office's reexamination of the patents-in-suit. [Docket No. 28.] The Court granted a similar motion in Cook Inc. v. Endologix, Inc., No. 1:09-cv-1248-WTL-TAB (S.D. Ind. Jan. 21, 2010), 2010 WL 325960 , concluding that a stay would not unduly prejudice the nonmoving party, would simplify the issues, and would reduce the burden of litigation on the parties and the Court. Granting a stay is similarly appropriate in this case. On re-examination, the PTO recently rejected all claims of the ' 256 patent and all but two dependent claims of the ' 565 patent as invalid. [Docket No. 28, Ex. 3 at 3, Ex. 4 at 3.] The pending PTO proceedings could therefore significantly narrow this case, which has not yet entered the case management stage. Though Plaintiff claims prejudice because it could not obtain a permanent injunction during a stay, Plaintiff has done nothing since filing its complaint last March to pursue injunctive relief. And Plaintiff's complaint that it needs discovery has presumably been resolved by agreement of the parties. [See Docket No. 36.] The Court therefore grants Defendant's motion to stay proceedings pending re-examination of the patents-in-suit. [Docket No. 28.]

Dated: 02/15/2011


Tim A. Baker
United States Magistrate Judge
Southern District of Indiana
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