

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)