

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Case No. SACV 16-02005 JLS (DFMx)

Date: May 2, 2017

Title: Si-Flash Drives, LLC v. Adata Technology (USA) Co., Ltd.

---

Present: **HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Terry Guerrero  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

**Proceedings: (In Chambers) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE (“OSC”)**

The Court has reviewed the Joint Rule 26(f) Report.

Therein, Defendant advises the Court that the present case is related to Si-Flash Drives, LLC v. Kingston Technology Company, Inc., SACV 16-02004 CJC. (Doc. 27 at 3.)

Therefore, the Court directs counsel’s attention to Local Rule 83-1.3 and General Order 16-05, § II.I.1.b. The Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why it should not file a Notice of Related Case. Although the mere fact that this and the 16-02004 case involve the same patent does not, by itself, compel the filing of a Notice of Related Cases, Plaintiff is advised to consider whether the cases “call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact[,] or . . . for other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.” (Gen. Order 16-5, § II.I.1.b(2)-(3).)

To satisfy this OSC, within seven days of the entry of this Order, Plaintiff shall file either a Notice of Related Cases or a response explaining why the two cases should not be “related” within the meaning of § II.I.1.b.

The Court CONTINUES the Scheduling Conference from May 5, 2017 to May 19, 2017 at 1:30 p.m.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Initials of Preparer: tg