UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Katana Silicon Technologies, LLC v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.; Micron Technology, Inc., et al. v. Longhorn IP, LLC

Case Nos. 1:22-cv-00273-DCN and 1:22-cv-00282-DCN, Document 93 · No. Case Nos. 1:22-cv-00273-DCN and 1:22-cv-00282-DCN · Decided May 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho denied Longhorn IP, LLC and Katana Silicon Technologies, LLC's motions to stay proceedings pending IPR appeal or, alternatively, to modify or waive an $8 million bond. The court held that the stay request was moot after the Federal Circuit resolved the appeal and concluded that the parties had not shown good cause to reconsider or reduce the bond. The court authorized either entity to deposit the full $8 million in the Court Registry Investment System and directed that the order be entered in both connected cases.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	May 18, 2026
DOCKET	Case Nos. 1:22-cv-00273-DCN and 1:22-cv-00282-DCN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	In two connected actions, Longhorn IP, LLC and Katana Silicon Technologies, LLC moved to stay enforcement of an $8 million bond order pending Federal Circuit review of a Patent Trial and Appeal Board decision or, alternatively, to waive, modify, or reduce the bond. The district court denied the motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) is governed by a standard substantially similar to Rule 59(e): reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy generally unavailable absent newly discovered evidence, clear error, or an intervening change in controlling law. The burden to establish clear error is high.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum decision and order from a federal district court
PARTIES	Longhorn IP, LLC, Katana Silicon Technologies, LLC v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration · mootness · civil procedure · patent law · appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure · Patent law · Commercial litigation · Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the request to stay enforcement of the bond order pending Federal Circuit review was moot after the Federal Circuit resolved the appeal.
2. Whether Katana's declaration that it would maintain cash reserves equal to the bond amount established good cause to waive the bond requirement under Idaho Code section 48-1707.
3. Whether the PTAB's invalidation of two patents required reduction of the bond amount.
4. Whether the PTAB's refusal to institute inter partes review of the third patent constituted new material information or clear error warranting reconsideration of the bond order.

HOLDINGS

1. The request to stay the bond order was moot because the Federal Circuit had resolved the appeal and Longhorn/Katana represented that they would not seek en banc review or certiorari.
2. The court declined to waive the $8 million bond requirement because Katana's manager merely declared that Katana was willing to maintain sufficient cash reserves and provided no evidence that Katana's current assets equaled the proposed bond amount.
3. The court refused to reduce the bond amount attributable to the invalidated patents because $750,000 per patent remained a good-faith estimate of Micron's total litigation costs.
4. The court declined to reconsider or reduce the bond based on the PTAB's refusal to institute IPR concerning the third patent because the decision was not new material information, did not establish clear error, and did not undermine the factors supporting the original reasonable-likelihood finding.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"Although Rule 59(e) permits a district court to reconsider and amend a previous order, the rule offers an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources."* (4)

> *"Since the Federal Circuit has resolved that appeal, and since Longhorn/Katana represent they will not seek en banc review or certiorari, their request for a stay is moot."* (5)

> *"Because the Motion for Stay is moot and Longhorn/Katana's other arguments for modifying the bond are legally infirm, the Court DENIES their Motion."* (9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Katana alleged that Micron infringed three patents, while Micron alleged that Katana and its parent, Longhorn, asserted patent infringement in bad faith in violation of Idaho law. The court had ordered Longhorn/Katana to post an $8 million bond after finding a reasonable likelihood of a bad-faith assertion. The PTAB later invalidated two patents and declined to institute inter partes review of a third; Longhorn/Katana argued that those developments reduced Micron's litigation costs and undermined the bond order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously found a reasonable likelihood that Katana's patent-infringement suit constituted a bad-faith assertion under Idaho law and ordered Longhorn/Katana to post an $8 million bond. The Federal Circuit dismissed an earlier appeal for lack of jurisdiction, the PTAB invalidated two patents and declined to institute inter partes review of a third, and the Federal Circuit later affirmed the PTAB. After lifting its stay and ordering the bond to be posted by May 18, 2026, the court denied the motions to stay, waive, or modify the bond and authorized deposit of the bond amount into the court registry.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fort Hall Reservation v. United States, 2023 WL 2456403, at *1 (D. Idaho Mar. 10, 2023)
- Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- McDowell v. Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam)
- Smith v. Clark County School District, 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Prete v. Bradbury, 438 F.3d 949, 968 n.23 (9th Cir. 2006)
- In re Motorola Solutions, Inc., 159 F.4th 30, 36 (Fed. Cir. 2025)
- Kansas v. Carr, 577 U.S. 108 (2016)
- Fuentes Aguilar De Perez v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3657596, at *1 (9th Cir. Dec. 17, 2025)
- Oxlaj-Perez v. Blanche, 2026 WL 1162694 (6th Cir. Apr. 29, 2026)

OPINION

Katana Silicon Technologies v. Micron Technology, Inc., et al.; Micron Technology, Inc., et al. v. Longhorn IP, LLC

PER CURIAM.

Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document 93 Filed.05/12/26 Page 1 of 10

U.S. COURTS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MAY 18 2026

FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

□ . Revd.____ Filed___Time__.

KATANA SILICON TECHNOLOGIES: STEPHEN W. KENYON
ie. CLERK, DISTRICT OF IDAHO
Case:No. 1 :22-cv-00282-DCN Plaintiff. Case.No. 1:22+cv-00273-DCN
V. MEMORANDUM DECISION
AND ORDER
MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,:et-al., To be entered in both cases. Defendants, MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,-et al., ‘Plaintiffs,
LONGHORN IP, LLC,
Defendant,
J. INTRODUCTION
Before the Court'are two identical motions filed in two connected actions..Longhorn IP, LLC:and Katana Silicon. Technologies, LLC (“Longhorn/Katana,,) have filed Motions to: Stay Pending IPR Appeal or, in the Alternative, Modify the Bond. Longhorn Dkt. 79/Katana: Dkt. 91.) The Court previously ordered Longhorn/Katana to post bond in the | Several documents have been filed in both. Katana and Longhorn. The Court will refer to documents tiled in both cases ‘(other than the Motions. themselves): by their docket number in: Micron Technology, Ine. Longhorn IP. LLC, Case Now 1:22-¢v-00273-DCN,
MEMORANDUM: DECISION'AND-ORDER - I
Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document'93 Filed 05/12/26 Page.2 of 10 arnount of $8 million by. May 18, 2026. See Dkts. 50; 74, Longhorn/Katana now asks. the Court to stay the effect of the Court’s bond order or, in the alternative, to modify or reduce the bond, Dkt, 79-1.° Because Longhorin/Katana’s request for a stay is moot; and' because they: have failed: to show good cause for relief from the bond order, the Court DENIES Longhorn/Katana’s Motion, The Clerk is further directed to enter this Order in both cases.
IL, BACKGROUND
In Case No. 1:22-cv-00282-DCN, Katana Silicon Technologies; LLC. alleges Micron* violated three of its patents. Katana Dkt. 1. In-Case No. 1:22-cv-00273-DCN, Micron alleges that Katana and its parent company, Longhorn IP, LLC, are engaging in-a bad-faith assettion of patent infringement in violation of Idaho law. Longhorn Dkt. 1-3.. Idaho’s Bad Faith Assertion of Patent Inftingement Act (the “Act,,) provides a cause of action against'a party: who asserts patent infringement in bad faith. Idaho Code. §§ 48- 1706-07. If the Court finds reasonable likelihood that the defendant asserted a patent claim.inebad faith, the Court must order the asserting party to.post:a bond “equal good faith estimate of the target’s costs to litigate the claim and amounts reasonably likely to be recovered under this chaptet.,, Idaho Code § 48-1707. "The Court finds the facts and legal anguments are adequately. presented and the decisional. process:would vot be.aided by oral arguinent, Accordingly, the Court elects to decide the Motion without oral argument. D. Idaho Local Rule 7.1(d)(1)(B). Os, thore precisely, three Miéron entities: Micron Technology, Inc.; Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.; and.Micron Technology Texas, LLC .(““Micron,,)..

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND-ORDER --2. Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document 93 Filed 05/12/26 Page.3 of 10 The Court previously found a reasonable likelihood that Katana's suittis.a bad faith assertion of patent infringement and ordered Longhorn/Katana' to post.an $8 million bond pursuant to Idaho Code-§ 48-1707. Longhorn/Katana appealed the Coutt's Order to the Federal Circuit, Dkt.52,.and Micron challenged Longhorn/Katana's patents through the Patent and Trademark Appeals Board's ("PTAB,,) inter partes review ("IPR.,) procedure. The Coutt stayed' the cases pending resolution of the appeal and IPR-proceedings, Dkt. 61. The Federal Circuit dismissed Longhorn/Katana's appeals for lack of jurisdiction. Dkt..68, The PTAB found two:of Longhorn/Katana's patents invalid (the '806.and '879 patents) and declined. to institute IPR proceedings regarding the third patent (the 7013 patent). Dkt. 65. Longhorn/Katana appealed from the PTAB's decision tothe Federal Afterthe Federal Circuit dismissed Longhorn/Katana's appeals and the PTAB found the *806'and.'879 patents invalid, the Court lifted its stays and ordered Longhorn/Katana to post the bond within 90-days: Dkt, 74, That order was entered on February 18, 2026, giving Longhorn/Katana until May 18 to'post.the bond or seek relief from the bond order timely fashion; Id. On April 17, 2026—after 58 of Longhorn/Katana's 90: days: had passed—Longhorn/Katana filed the instant Motions, asking the Court to:stay proceedings pending the Federal Circuit's review of the PTAB's decision, to waive'the bond amount under Idaho 4 The Court previously ordered "Longhorn or Katana, to post the bond, but more recently referred to Katana alone as obligated to post borid,.For clarity's sake: either Longhorn or Katana may. post.the bond, but the bond must.cover both-entities" possible liability under the Act regardless of which. entity posts the bond:

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER -3

Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document Filed 05/12/26 Page 4°of 10 Code § 48-1707,-or to: modify the bond amount to reflect Micron's reduced cost to litigate and Longhorn/Katana's increased likelihood of success on the merits following the PTAB's decisions. Dkt. 79-1. Four days later, the Federal Circuit affirmed the PTAB. Dkt, 83. Micron opposed the Motions, Dkt. 91, and Longhorn/Katana have replied, Dit, 92, The matters:are ripe for review.

i. LEGAL STANDARD

A. Motion for Reconsideration The standard for reconsideration:under 54(b) is substantially: the same as.that used for motions. to reconsider under Rule 59(e). Sez Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fort Hall Resv..v, United States, 2023 WL 2456403; at *1 (D. Idaho Mar. 10, 2023). "Although Rule 59(e) permits a district court to reconsider and atnend a previous order, the rule offers an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources... Kova Eniters., Ine. v. Est. of Bishop, 229 F.3d'877, 890 (9th: Cit. 2000) (citation modified). "A motion -for reconsideration under Rule 59(e) 'should not □□ granted, absent highly unusual 'circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered. evidence,:committed clear error or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.',, McDowell v. Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 (9th Cir. 1999) (per'curiam) (emphasis in original) (citation modified); “Clear error occurs. when the reviewing court :on the entire:record is. left with the definite and firm conviction 'that'a mistake has been committed,,, Smith y, Clark Cnty. Seh. Dist., 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th Cir, 2013):(citation modified), The burden of proving:clear erroris high. As the Ninth Circuit has colorfully put it, “[t]o be clearly erroneous, a decision

 must'strike [the reviewing Court]:as more than just maybe or probably wrong; it must’. .. strike us.as wrong with the force of a five-week-old, unrefrigerated dead fish.,, Prete v, Bradbury, 438 F.3d.949, 968:'n.23 (9th Cit, 2006) (citation modified). B: Idaho Bond Requirements Under Idaho law, Upon.. ....a finding by the court that a target has established a reasonable likelihood that a person has made-a bad faith assertion of patent infringement in violation of this chapter, the court shall require the person to post a bond in-an amount-equal to.a good faith estimate of the target’s costs to litigate the claim:and amounts reasonably likely to be recovered ‘under this chapter’. ..... The court may waive the bond requirement if it finds the person has.available assets equal to the amount of the proposed bond or for other good cause shown. Idaho: Code § 48-1707, The Act permits a prevailing target to recover equitable relief, damages, costs and fees (including reasonable.attorney’s fees), and exemplary damages of $50,000 or treble actual damages (whichever is greater). Idaho Code § 48-1706.

IV.. DISCUSSION

Longhorn/Katana’s motion 'to stay was predicated on their pending appeal before the Federal Circuit., Since the Federal Circuit has resolved that appeal, and since Longhorn/Katana represent they will not seek en bane review or certiorari, their request for.a-stay is moot. Dkt, 92, at 2 1.1. Two:issués remain: Longhorn/Katana’s request that the Court waive the bond requirement and their request that the Court adjust the bond requirement in light.of the PTAB’s decision.

 A. Request to Waive the Bond Longhorn/Katana ask the Court to waive the bond requirement because Katana swears it will’maintain ‘cash reserves equal tothe amount of the proposed ‘bond. Dkt, 79-1, at 7..In.support of their contention, they include a declaration of Khaled Fekih-Romdhane, Katana’s Manager. Id:; seg-also Dkt. 79+2, at 2. Mt. Fekih-Romdhané declares that “Katana is willing to maintain'a balance equal to-or greater than. the required bond'in its savings account for the duration of this litigation :in lieu of posting the required bond if permitted to:do:so'by the Court,,, and that Katana is willing to. provide: periodic’ status reports. Dkt. 79-2. However, Katana: presents ‘no evidence of what.its: current cash.reserves are or the value of its assets. Mr; Fekih-Romdhane’s declaration, standing alone, is insufficient: for the Court‘to find that Katana’s current assets:are equal to the amount of the proposed bond. The Coutt, therefore, DENIES Longhorn/Katana’s request to: waive the bond. However, the Court notes: that if Longhorti/Katana is willing to maintain cash reserves.equal:to:the bond-amount, it should have-no difficulty depositing that amount into the

Court Registry Investment System ("CRIS,,). Accordingly, the Court grants Longhorn/Katana leave:to deposit the sum of $8,000,000 in the CRIS. B. Reconsideration Based on the PTAB Decision: The PTAB concluded that two of Katana's patents: were invalid and declined to institute IPR proceedings against.a third. Longhorn/Katana: argue both the invalidity decision:and the PTO Director's decision declining to institute IPR proceedings constitutes grounds:for reconsidering the bond amount.

 1 Invalidity Decisions Longhorn/Katana argue that by invalidating the '806 and '879 patents, the PTAB has greatly reduced Micron's costs to litigate the patent claims against it, as well as the bad faith patent claims under Idaho law and the Court should reduce its bond amount as. result, Micron argues the amount should be maintained because it has already incurred four years of experises related to prosecuting the IPR proceedings and defending the PTAB's decision before the Federal Circuit. In reply, Longhorn/Katana ask the Court to reduce the bond amountattributable to:'806 and. '879 patents ta-reflect Micron's actual costs rather than the Court's marginal estimate of $750,000 per patent. The Court will notreduce the bond arnount at this time because that amount remains a good faith estimate of Micron's. litigation costs. Although IPR proceedings may: be cheaper than: $750,000 per patent in the abstract, the sources Longhorn/Katana: cites suggest that $750,000 would be.a high, but not extraordinary, estimate of costs. Sze Dkt. 92, at 6 (citing Husch Blackwell LLP blog post estimating IPR proceedings at $200,000 to:$500,000). And: there are reasons to believe Micron's total costs regarding' the '806.and °8'79 patents were well higher in this case than the IPR average:alone: the parties have already had to. litigate two appeals covering the '806.and *879. patents at this. point, in addition two-full IPR proceedings and all motion practice in these actions prior to May 7, 2026 (when Longhorn/Katana conceded the patents were invalid). Dkt, 92. The Court finds that'$750,000 pet patent remains:a good faith estimate of Micron's total costs of litigating the '806 and °879 patents through IPR proceedings, two:rounds of appeals, and proceedings in'these cases so far.

2. Institition Denied as tothe '013 Fatent

The Director'of the Patent and Trademark. Office empowered to.decline a party's request tointstitute IPR proceedings. 35 U.S.C. § 314, By statute, the Director must decline when the petitioner fails to show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on the claims challenged in the petition, 35 U.S.C. §314(a). The Ditector's decision is absolutely unreviewable except (possibly) for constitutional or statutory: errors, In re Motorola Sols., Ine:, 159-F-Ath 30, 36 (Bed. Cir, 2025). Here, the Director found Micron did not establish:a 'reasonable likelihood that the °013 patent is unpatentable. Micron. Technology, Inc..v. Katana Silicon Technologies LLC, No. IPR2023-00105 (P.T.A.B. June 14, 2023), Longhorn/Katana asks the Court to reduce the bond amount with respect to the remaining ’013:patent:as.a result. The Court declines to-do so because the PTAB’s decision does not constitute new. material information and the Court did not clearly ert; thus, reconsideration would be inappropriate. See McDowell, 197 F.3d.at 1255, The PTAB decision at most'suggests the ’013 patent might be invalid, but the Coutt. did not hinge:its reasonable likelihood finding on.the validity of the ’013-patent. ‘Micron has maintained before this.Court that it-did not inftinge the °013.patent——an issue which thé PTAB did not:pass on; and which could still substantiaté a bad faith assertion claim: Katana Dkt. 13. The Court weighed several factors in reaching that decision, including thé inadequacy.of Longhorn/Katana’s demand letter analysis, Longhorn/Katana’s history of litigation and its: communications with Micron, and. Longhorn/Katana’s corporate structure to.conchide Micron was reasonably likely to succeed in arguing its bad faith claim MEMORANDUM. DECISION AND ORDER~ 8: Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document 93 Filed 05/12/26 Page 9 of 10 argument. See: Dkt. 50, at 22-26, The PTAB’s decision regarding the ’013 patent does not call:into: question the Court’s application of any of those factors: Thus, there:are no material changes which would justify reconsideration of the Court’s reasonable likelihood finding. Moreover, to the extent Longhorn/Katana ask the Court to reconsider the portion of its May 3, 2023 Memorandum Decision and Order interpreting: the term “reasonable likelihood, as used in Idaho Code § 48-1707, the Court does not find it clearly erred. Citatioris'to cases in far different substantive and procedural contexts do not persuade the Court that it incorrectly applied the reasonable likelihood standard in that Order. Cf Kansas v. Carr, 577 U.S. 108, (2016) (defining reasonable likelihood in. the capital sentencing context); Fuentes Aguilar De Perez v. Bondi, 2025 WL 3657596, at *1 (9th:Cir. Dec: 17, 2025), abrogated by Oxlaj-Perez v, Blanche, 2026 WL.1162694 (6th Cir. Apr. 29, 2026) (defining reasonable likelihood in the BIA motion to reopen denial context). Thus, the Coutt: declines to reconsider the: bond amount based on the PTAB’s décision denying IPR on the ’013 patent or the other arguments Longhorn/Katana raise.

VV. CONCLUSION

The Court ordéred Longhorn/Katana to post bond over two years ago. The time has finally come for Longhorn/Katana.to do so. Because the Motion for Stay is moot. and Longhorn/Katana’s other-arguments for modifying the bond are légally infirm, the: Court DENIES their Motion.

VI, ORDER

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: MEMORANDUM DECISION: AND-ORDER - 9: Case 1:22-cv-00273-DCN Document 93 Filed 05/12/26 Page 10 of 10 ‘1. Longhorn/Katana’s Motions to Stay Pending IPR Appeal or, in the Alternative, Modify the Bond (Dkt. 79 case no. 1:22-cv-00273-DCN; Dkt. 91 in case no. 1:22-¢v-00282-DCN) are DENIED:

2. Either Longhorn or Katana must post bond. consistent with D. Idaho Local Rule

_ 65,2, Any such ‘bond must cover both entities’ liability. 3, In lien of.a private bond, the entities may deposit the full cash value of the bond into court. a. IT IS ORDERED thatthe Clerk of Court invest the amount of $8,000,000 in the Court Registry Investment System (“CRIS,,), which is administered by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts under 28 U.S.C, § 2045, and said funds to remain invested pending ‘further Order of the Court. b. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Administrative Office of the Courts is authorized atid directed by this Order to deduct the investment services fee for the management of investments in the CRIS and the registry fee for maintaining accounts deposited with the Court.

4. The Clerk is directed to enter this Order in both cases,

eo □□ wey 12,20" ©) cig” US. District Court Judge