

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Motion GRANTED.

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 AMBROSE PRINTING COMPANY, )  
 )  
 Defendant. )

Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-0581

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

---

JOINT MOTION TO STAY CASE PENDING DETERMINATION OF INTER PARTES  
REVIEW PROCEEDINGS

---

Plaintiff CTP Innovations, LLC (“CTP”) and Defendant Ambrose Printing Company jointly move the Court to stay this case pending determination by the United States Patent and Trademark Office’s Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”) of two petitions seeking to invalidate the two patents-in-suit: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,611,349 (“‘349 patent”) and 6,738,155 (“‘155 patent”). In support of this Motion, the parties state as follows:

On July 29, 2013, Printing Industries of America (“PIA”) filed a Petition for Inter Partes Review in which it seeks to invalidate all claims of the ‘349 patent. On August 2, 2013, PIA filed a Petition for Inter Partes Review in which it seeks to invalidate all claims of the ‘155 patent. In light of these Petitions, and notwithstanding CTP’s intent to vigorously defend the validity of the patents-in-suit, the parties submit that a stay of the pending case is appropriate.

“Courts have inherent power to manage their dockets and stay proceedings, including the authority to order a stay pending conclusion of a PTO reexamination.” *Ethicon, Inc. v. Quigg*, 849 F.2d 1422, 1426-27 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citations omitted). “There is a ‘liberal policy in favor of granting motions to stay proceedings pending the outcome’ of re-examination, especially in