

and control over the Cox subsidiaries in Kansas. Plaintiff has submitted numerous publicly-available documents that, when coupled with the allegations set forth in the Amended Complaint, controvert Defendant's position that CCI has no contacts in Kansas arising under or relating to Plaintiff's patent infringement allegations, including ownership of equipment used for that purpose. Plaintiff has also submitted the declaration of Bruce McLeod, the Executive Director of Service and Enterprise Architecture for Cox Communications, submitted in a different case in the Eastern District of Virginia, that suggests CCI operates as more than a holding company and actually directs and controls the Kansas subsidiaries named in this lawsuit. The Court finds that Plaintiff has pointed to "pertinent facts bearing on the question of jurisdiction" that are controverted.³ Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for jurisdictional discovery is granted and the parties shall have until August 3, 2012 to complete discovery relevant to this issue in advance of the hearing on this motion.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE COURT that Plaintiff's request for jurisdictional discovery is granted; limited jurisdictional discovery shall be completed by August 3, 2012. An evidentiary hearing on CCI's Motion to Dismiss is set for August 9, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. in Kansas City, KS.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 6, 2012

S/ Julie A. Robinson
JULIE A. ROBINSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³See *id.*; *Commissariat A L'Ennergie Atomique v. Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corp.*, 395 F.3d 1315, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2005).