

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

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-462 LED
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	
Distinctive Developments Ltd.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	
	§	

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-463 LED
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	
Electronic Arts Inc.,	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-464 LED
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	
Full Fat Productions Ltd.,	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-466 LED
	§	

vs.
Gameloft S.A.,
Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,
Plaintiffs,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 6:12-CV-467 LED

vs.
Halfbrick Studios Pty Ltd.,
Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,
Plaintiffs,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 6:12-CV-468 LED

vs.
Laminar Research, LLC,
Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,
Plaintiffs,

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CASE NO. 6:12-CV-470 LED

vs.
Mojang AB,
Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Uniloc USA, Inc., Uniloc Luxembourg S.A.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	CASE NO. 6:12-CV-472 LED
	§	
vs.	§	
	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Square Enix, Inc.,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	
	§	

CONSOLIDATION ORDER

The passage of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), which clarified the joinder requirements for cases alleging patent infringement, has resulted in a significant increase in the number of “serially” filed patent cases on the Court’s docket. Similarly, the Federal Circuit’s recent *In re EMC Corp.* decision leads to a nearly analogous result for pre-AIA filings because multi-defendant cases may be severed “[u]nless there is an actual link between the facts underlying each claim of infringement.” 677 F.3d 1351, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Such serially filed or severed cases, by their nature, involve common issues of law or fact, including claim construction and validity. “If actions before the Court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). In applying Rule 42, a court has considerable discretion. *In re EMC Corp.*, 677 F.3d at 1360; *see also Lurea v. M/V Albata*, 625 F.3d 181, 194 (5th Cir. 2011) (“Rule 42(a) provides district courts with broad authority to consolidate actions that ‘involve a common question of law or fact.’”). Because the above-styled cases involve a common question of law or fact, consolidation of the cases would promote efficient case management.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the above-styled cases shall be consolidated for

pretrial issues only, with the exception of venue. The earliest filed civil action shall serve as the lead case for consolidated issues. The Clerk of the Court shall add the consolidated defendants to the lead case, as well as Lead and Local Counsel only. Any other counsel who wishes to appear in the lead case shall file a notice of appearance in that case. The individual cases will remain active for venue motions and trial. Should the parties file motions to transfer or motions to sever and transfer, the Court will consider these motions only as to the defendants in the originally filed (member) cases, not as to all defendants in the pretrial consolidated case. *See Norman*, 2012 WL 3307942, at *4. All motions, other than venue motions, shall be filed in the consolidated case.

A uniform Docket Control, Discovery, ESI, and Protective Order shall govern the consolidated case, regardless of whether the same have previously been entered in individual actions. All parties to the consolidated case are **ORDERED** to meet-and-confer and, if necessary, file objections to the previously agreed to Docket Control and Discovery Orders filed in the lead case. The local rules' page limitations for *Markman* briefs and other motions will apply to the consolidated case. To further promote judicial economy and to conserve the parties' resources, the Court encourages the parties to file a notice with the Court in the event that there are other related cases currently pending on the Court's docket, as well as any future cases Plaintiff intends to file, that may also be appropriate for consolidation with this case.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 1st day of February, 2013.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonard Davis', written over a horizontal line.

**LEONARD DAVIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**