

Motion	Ruling
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 1 to exclude any reliance on third-party documents produced late (this week)	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 2 to exclude any reliance on third-party documents from nonparty, Chinese chip	GRANTED. The Court found that because the documents lack a sponsoring witness, Defendants’

Motion	Ruling
manufacturer [REDACTED]	experts, witnesses, and attorneys are further precluded from relying on or referencing for any purpose the documents produced by [REDACTED], which bear Bates Nos. [REDACTED] - 0000001-[REDACTED]-0000008.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 3 to exclude any references to any [REDACTED]	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 4 to exclude any testimony concerning any issues related to Defendants’ now dropped inequitable conduct and unclean hands allegations	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 5 to exclude any references, evidence, testimony (including expert testimony) or arguments regarding alleged non-infringing alternatives	DENIED. CH may introduce evidence related to alleged non-infringing alternatives that are disclosed in CH’s expert reports, and Super Lighting may introduce any evidence showing there are no non-infringing alternatives, including CH’s interrogatory responses that do not identify any non-infringing alternatives.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 6 to exclude any references, evidence, testimony (including expert testimony), or arguments that are inconsistent with or rejected in the Court’s claim constructions	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 7 to exclude affirmative deposition designations of Aiming Xiong from the unrelated MaxLite case on different patents	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 8 to exclude information relating to Plaintiffs’ political affiliations, Plaintiffs’ nationalities, and COVID-19	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting’s Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 9 to exclude references, evidence, testimony, or arguments regarding the [REDACTED]	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.

Motion	Ruling
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 10 to exclude evidence, argument, and testimony concerning comparisons of Accused Products or their components with either prior art or Super Lighting's products/components	GRANTED.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 11 to exclude information regarding CH Lighting's ownership of patents	MOOTED. This motion was dropped by Super Lighting, and is therefore moot.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 12 to exclude information regarding certain inventors not testifying and no longer working for Super Lighting	MOOTED. This motion was dropped by Super Lighting, and is therefore moot.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 13 to exclude information regarding [REDACTED]	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 14 to exclude any suggestion that Super Lighting's reduction of the Asserted Patents or patent claims to streamline this litigation amounts to a concession of non-infringement or invalidity	GRANTED.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 15 to exclude any reference to declarations provided by Defendants' witnesses or any third party	GRANTED.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 16 to exclude any reference to any expert's prior work with Super Lighting's lawyers or retention by Perkins Coie LLP	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 17 to exclude any disparaging remarks regarding the USPTO and examiners	GRANTED.
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 18 to exclude improper inequitable conduct arguments (couched as inventorship allegations) from the jury	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.

Motion	Ruling
Super Lighting's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 19 to exclude reliance or mention of any third-party opinions or unasserted patents	GRANTED.

CH's Motions *in Limine*

Motion	Ruling
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 1 to preclude Plaintiffs from offering outlandish or conspiratorial theories at trial	GRANTED.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 2 to preclude Plaintiffs from discussing the political affiliations of witnesses	GRANTED. This motion was agreed to by the parties, and is therefore granted.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 3 to preclude Plaintiffs from discussing discovery disputes and other extraneous matter	GRANTED.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 4 to preclude Plaintiffs from insinuating that [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	DENIED. The Court clarified that the parties should approach the bench before intimating that a witness from the other side did something unethical or illegal, such as stealing.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 5 to preclude Plaintiffs from referencing the RadIP press releases and Mr. Jiang's related comments	GRANTED.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 6 to preclude Plaintiffs from referencing the [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	DENIED.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 7 to exclude any reference to the "presumption of validity"	DENIED.
CH's Motion <i>in Limine</i> No. 8 to preclude Plaintiffs from referencing Barry Qin's unfounded testimony about the advantages of Super Lighting's tube lamps	DENIED.

CH's Daubert Motion

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Exclude Certain Opinions and Testimony of Lauren Kindler is DENIED.

Super Lighting's Motion for Sanctions

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following instruction will be provided to the jury in both preliminary and final jury instructions:

"CH Lighting and Ruising first learned about the asserted '140 Patent on February 16, 2019, and first learned of the asserted '540 and '125 Patents in July 2019. Upon learning of the asserted patents, CH Lighting and Ruising took no actions other than to retain litigation counsel for this case on or about November 12, 2020."

The question of attorneys' fees requested in Plaintiffs' Motion is hereby STAYED until after trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 15th day of October, 2021.


THE HONORABLE ALAN D ALBRIGHT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE