

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

CORE WIRELESS LICENSING
S.A.R.L.,
v.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:14-cv-911-JRG-RSP (lead case)

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., and LG
ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM
U.S.A., INC.

Case No. 2:14-cv-912 (consolidated)

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
DENYING-IN-PART DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS**

Before the Court is Defendants’ Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation Denying-in-Part Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (“Defendants’ Objections”). Dkt. No. 209.

In the Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge correctly held that Core’s complaints state claims for inducing infringement and for contributory infringement that satisfy the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Dkt. No. 192 at 4-6. The Magistrate Judge also correctly held that Defendants bear the burden of establishing that Plaintiff’s breach of contract claim is not legally cognizable, and that Defendants failed to meet this burden. *Id.* at 6-9. The parties have not objected to the other holdings of the Report and Recommendation.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court agrees with the conclusions of the Report and Recommendation, and the Court finds the Magistrate Judge’s rulings neither “clearly erroneous [n]or contrary to law.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); FED.R.CIV.P. 72(a). Accordingly, Defendants’ Objections are **OVERRULED** and the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation Denying-in-Part Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 192) is hereby **ADOPTED**.

So Ordered and Signed on this

Sep 29, 2015



 RODNEY GILSTRAP
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE