UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

ONE NUMBER CORPORATION,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	1:10-cv-312-RLY-TAB
)	
GOOGLE, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	

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

Copies to:

Jeff M. Barron BARNES & THORNBURG LLP jeff.barron@btlaw.com

Birk K. Billingsley KRIEG DEVAULT LLP bbillingsley@kdlegal.com

Dean E. McConnell KRIEG DEVAULT LLP dmcconnell@kdlegal.com

Scott Stuart Morrisson KRIEG DEVAULT LLP smorrisson@kdlegal.com

Jennifer Lynn Schuster BARNES & THORNBURG LLP jschuster@btlaw.com

Todd G. Vare BARNES & THORNBURG LLP todd.vare@btlaw.com

Alastair J. Warr KRIEG DEVAULT LLP awarr@kdlegal.com