

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

MORRYDE INTERNATIONAL INC v. AIRXCEL INC

No. 3:25-CV-271-CCB-JEM, United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana (March 6, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana sets the scope and schedule for expedited discovery concerning MORryde’s motion for a preliminary injunction. Discovery is limited primarily to alleged irreparable harm, prior art, and patent inventorship, with deadlines established for written discovery, depositions, expert disclosures, and the evidentiary hearing. The court also grants Airxcel’s motion to stay all other case deadlines pending resolution of the preliminary-injunction motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cristal C. Brisco
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana
DECIDED	March 6, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-271-CCB-JEM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order resolving Airxcel's motion for an evidentiary hearing and expedited discovery concerning MORryde's motion for a preliminary injunction, defining the scope and schedule of that discovery, and granting Airxcel's motion to stay all regular case deadlines pending resolution of the preliminary-injunction motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied its broad discretion to manage its docket and stay proceedings, considering whether a stay would unduly prejudice or tactically disadvantage the nonmoving party, simplify the issues and streamline trial, and reduce the burden of litigation. For expedited discovery supporting an evidentiary hearing, the court required discovery likely to be productive in advance of the hearing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

discovery dispute

injunctions

patent infringement

patent law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

patent litigation

civil procedure

preliminary injunctions

discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What limited discovery would be productive and appropriate before the evidentiary hearing on MORryde's motion for a preliminary injunction?
2. Whether Airxcel established good cause for staying all regular case deadlines pending resolution of MORryde's preliminary-injunction motion.

HOLDINGS

1. The court permitted limited expedited discovery into MORryde's alleged irreparable harm, including price erosion, business and customer losses, and the RV entry-step market, and into the likelihood of success on the merits only as to prior art and inventorship in the context of patent invalidity. General discovery into claim scope and inequitable conduct was not permitted because it risked converting the evidentiary hearing into a full bench trial.
2. The court granted Airxcel's motion to stay all case deadlines pending resolution of MORryde's preliminary-injunction motion because Airxcel showed good cause, the stay would not unduly prejudice MORryde, and the stay was likely to simplify the issues, streamline trial, and reduce duplicative litigation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To justify an evidentiary hearing on a preliminary injunction, the party who seeks the hearing “must be able to persuade the court” that such “a hearing would be productive.””

“General discovery into the scope of asserted claims and inequitable conduct would threaten transforming the evidentiary hearing into a full-blown bench trial.”

“The Court has broad discretion to manage its docket.”

“Accordingly, the Court finds that Airxcel has shown good cause for its stay request.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

MORryde sued Airxcel in a patent-infringement action and sought a preliminary injunction concerning the asserted '534 and '850 patents. Airxcel challenged the patents and proposed discovery concerning inventorship, prior art, claim scope, inequitable conduct, and alleged irreparable harm, including price erosion, lost business and customers, and the RV entry-step market. The parties disputed the scope and timing of expedited discovery, and MORryde opposed staying regular case deadlines, arguing that a stay would create a tactical disadvantage and would not materially simplify the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously granted Airxcel's motion for an evidentiary hearing and expedited discovery concerning MORryde's motion for a preliminary injunction and directed the parties to submit a joint proposal regarding discovery scope and timing. After reviewing the parties' competing positions in their joint proposal, the court authorized limited discovery and established deadlines. The court also granted Airxcel's separate motion to stay all other case deadlines pending resolution of the preliminary-injunction motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ty, Inc. v. GMA Accessories, Inc., 132 F.3d 1167, 1171 (7th Cir. 1997)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Illinois Republican Party v. Pritzker, 973 F.3d 760, 763 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Alicea v. County of Cook, 88 F.4th 1209, 1218 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997)
- Sadler as Trustee of Larry R. Sadler Irrevocable Trust v. Retail Properties of America, Inc., No. 12 C 5882 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 27, 2013)