


**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

OPTIS WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY, LLC,	§	
PANOPTIS PATENT MANAGEMENT,	§	
LLC, OPTIS CELLULAR	§	Case No. 2:17-cv-00123-JRG-RSP
TECHNOLOGY, LLC.,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	
	§	
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD.,	§	
HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., HUAWEI	§	
DEVICE CO. LTD.,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	

ORDER

Before the court is the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Payne, which recommends that Plaintiffs’ motion for an anti-suit injunction be denied without prejudice. ECF No. 137. For dispositive matters referred to a magistrate judge, the district court must “determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). “The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommend disposition.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). No objections have been filed, and the time to do so has now passed. Accordingly, upon de novo review, the report and recommendation is **ADOPTED**, and Plaintiffs’ motion for an anti-suit injunction, ECF No. 76, is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of May, 2018.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE