Doc. 43

Dockets.Justia.com

MyECHeck, Inc. v. Zipmark, Inc. et al

Pursuant to the Court's Minute Order dated October 7, 2015 (Dkt. 38), the parties hereby submit this proposed modified scheduling order.

Event	Deadline
Fact Discovery directed to Section 101 issues, including: • Written discovery responses to be provided in 14 days of electronic or personal service • Responsive Documents to be produced within 10 days after responses • Fact Depositions, if any, to be noticed 10 days in advance of proposed deposition date, directed to Section 101 issues	November 25, 2015
Zipmark Initial Expert Statement(s) and Tutorial Summary	December 11, 2015
MyECheck Responsive Expert Statement(s) and Tutorial Summary	December 24, 2015
Expert Depositions completed	January 15, 2016
Zipmark's Supplemental Brief Regarding Patent Ineligibility of U.S. Patent No. 7,329,913 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Maximum 25 pages)	January 29, 2016
MyECheck's Opposition to Zipmark's Supplemental Brief (Maximum 25 pages)	February 12 2016
Zipmark's Reply in Support of Supplemental Brief (Maximum 10 pages)	February 19, 2016

The parties propose that a further hearing regarding the patent ineligibility of U.S. Patent No. 7,389,913 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be held on **March 8, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.**

Scope

Pursuant to the Court's statements at the Oct. 7, 2015 hearing, the parties understand that the scope of discovery will be limited to the issue of whether or not the patent-in-suit, U.S. Patent No. 7,389,913, is eligible for patent protection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The parties further understand that all other issues in this litigation will be stayed pending resolution of the issue of patent eligibility.

Content of Expert Statements 1 The parties propose that the Expert Statements contain, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 2 3 26(a)(2)(C)(i), the subject matter on which the party's expert is expected to present evidence at the Court's hearing regarding these matters. The parties further propose that the Expert 4 Statements also contain, pursuant to Rule 26(a)(2)(C)(ii), a summary of the facts and opinions to 5 which the expert is expected to testify at the Court's hearing regarding these matters, including a 6 7 detailed summary of any tutorial that will be offered. Supplemental Briefing Page Limit 8 The parties propose that the page limit of the supplemental briefs be the same as this 9 10 Court's page limits on motions for summary judgment. Specifically, the parties propose the 11 following page limits: Zipmark's Supplemental Brief: 25 pages 12 MyECheck's Opposition to Zipmark's Supplemental Brief: 25 pages 13 Zipmark's Reply in Support of Supplemental Brief: 10 pages 14 15 16 Dated: October 13, 2015 Respectfully Submitted, 17 s/Brian R. Katz s/ Paul D. Tripodi, II Brian R. Katz, State Bar No. 88895 Paul D. Tripodi II, State Bar No. 162380 18 brian@katzbusinesslaw.com ptripodi@wsgr.com 19 Attorney for Plaintiff Attorneys for Defendant MYECHECK, INC. ZIPMARK, INC. 20 21 22 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 25 /s/ John A. Mendez Dated: 10/15/2015_____ 26 Hon. John A. Mendez United States District Court Judge

27

28