

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

14cv0111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

v.

PARROT S.A., PARROT, INC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER OF COURT RE: DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY PENDING INTER  
PARTES REVIEW OR TRANSFER VENUE (DOC. NO. 17)**

On January 24, 2014, Plaintiff filed a Complaint, in this Court, against Defendants alleging that Defendants' toy drones and related app violated two of Plaintiff's United States Patents (the '071 and '748 Patents). Doc. No. 1. On May 6, 2014, Defendants filed petitions in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") seeking inter partes review of the two patents at issue. Presently before this Court is Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review or Transfer Venue. Doc. No. 17. Defendants move this Court to stay the case pending inter partes review (to "streamline the case" and because Plaintiff "does not appear" to do business in the United States) or to transfer the case to the Eastern District of Michigan, where Defendant Parrot, Inc. is based. Doc. No. 18. Plaintiff opposes this Motion. Doc. No. 23.

Although this case in its early stages, the Court declines to exercise its discretion to stay the action. Plaintiff has filed a Complaint in the Court and this Court has jurisdiction to hear all issues brought by Plaintiff. Parallel proceedings, filed after the present action, do not affect jurisdiction. This is consistent with this Court's practice of denying motions to stay pending review by the USPTO in cases in which a plaintiff opposes the motion. Further, there is no

compelling reason to disturb Plaintiff's choice of venue and transfer the case to the Eastern District of Michigan pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). This forum will provide for the just, speedy, and efficient resolution of Plaintiff's claims and Defendants' defenses. Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

AND NOW, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2014, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Inter Partes Review or Motion to Transfer (Doc. No. 17) is **DENIED**.

s/ Arthur J. Schwab  
Arthur J. Schwab  
United States District Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties