

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP

David Eiseman (Bar No. 114758)
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
davideiseman@quinnemanuel.com

Attorneys for Defendant
Barnes & Noble, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC, PHOENIX DIGITAL SOLUTIONS LLC, AND PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,)	CASE NO. C 12-3863 NC
)	
)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
)	STAYING ACTION PURSUANT TO 28
)	U.S.C. § 1659
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	
)	
BARNES & NOBLE, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

STIPULATION

Plaintiffs Technology Properties Limited, LLC, Phoenix Digital Solutions, LLC, and Patriot Scientific Corporation (collectively, “TPL”), and Defendant Barnes & Noble, Inc. (“Barnes & Noble”) herein seek to stay this entire civil action (“Action”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659 and the Court’s inherent powers. Subject to Barnes & Noble reserving its right to contest jurisdiction, venue, and service and all other rights to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint at a later time, TPL and Barnes & Noble hereby agree and stipulate to a stay of this Action, on the following grounds:

1. TPL filed its Complaint in this Court against Barnes & Noble in this case on July 24, 2012, asserting infringement of U.S. Patent No. 5,440,749 (“the ‘749 Patent”), U.S. Patent No. 5,530,890 (“the ‘890 Patent”), and U.S. Patent No. 5,809,336 (“the ‘336 Patent”).

2. On that same day, TPL also filed a Complaint under Section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (As Amended) with the U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC Complaint”) alleging infringement of the ‘336 Patent. TPL’s ITC Complaint was filed against a number of respondents, including Barnes & Noble, the only named defendant in this Action.

3. The ITC’s Notice of Institution of ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-853 was published in the Federal Register on August 24, 2012. *See 77 Fed Reg. 51,572* (Aug. 24, 2012). Section 1659 of Title 28 provides that where “a civil action involving the parties that are also parties to a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, at the request of a party to the civil action that is also a respondent in the proceeding before the Commission, the district court shall stay, until the determination of the Commission becomes final, proceedings in the civil action with respect to any claim that involves the same issues involved in the proceedings before the Commission.” 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a). This stay is mandatory if such a request is made within thirty (30) days from institution of the Investigation. *Id.*

4. All of the requirements of Section 1659 have been met as to the ‘336 patent because (i) the parties to this Action are also parties to ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-853; (ii) Barnes & Noble, who is also a named respondent in ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-853, requests a stay, which TPL does not oppose; and (iii) the patent-infringement claims at issue in this Action include those at issue in ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-853. Further, to conserve judicial resources, TPL and Barnes & Noble agree that the Action should be stayed as to the ‘749 and ‘890 patents asserted in this Action pending final resolution of ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-853. The Court has the inherent power to grant such a request. *See SanDisk Corp. v. Phison Elecs. Corp.*, 538 F. Supp. 2d 1060, 1065 (W.D. Wis. 2008) (district courts have the power to stay patent infringement proceedings that pertain to similar issues in investigations pending in the ITC even when the patents at issue are not identical).

Accordingly, subject to the approval of the Court, the parties agree to stay the entirety of this Action, including, without limitation, the time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint, until the determination of the Commission becomes final in ITC Investigation No.

1 337-TA-853, including any and all appeals. The parties agree that Barnes & Noble need not
2 respond to the Complaint before the Court approves this Stipulation and Order, and further agree
3 that upon dissolution of the stay, Barnes & Noble will have thirty (30) days to answer or otherwise
4 respond to the Complaint.

5 For all the foregoing reasons, TPL and Barnes & Noble respectfully request that the Court
6 stay this action as to all parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1659(a) and the Court's inherent powers.

7
8 Dated: September 21, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

9
10
11 By: /s/ David Eiseman
David Eiseman

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 Barnes & Noble, Inc.

14 Dated: September 21, 2012

AGILITY IP LAW, LLP

15
16 By: /s/ Michelle G. Breit
Michelle G. Breit

17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Technology
18 Properties Limited LLC and Phoenix Digital
19 Solutions LLC

20 Dated: September 21, 2012

KIRBY NOONAN LANCE & HOGUE LLP

21
22 By: /s/ Charles T. Hoge
Charles T. Hoge

23 Attorneys for Plaintiff Patriot Scientific
24 Corporation
25
26
27
28

ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 26 2012



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify on this 21st day of September, 2012 that a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically through the Court's CM/ECF system, with notice of case activity automatically generated and sent electronically to all parties.

Dated: September 21, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By: /s/ David Eiseman

David Eiseman

Attorneys for Defendant
Barnes & Noble, Inc.