

1 BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
 JACK C. BERENZWEIG (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 2 WILLIAM H. FRANKEL (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 JASON C. WHITE (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 3 CHARLES M. MCMAHON (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 NBC Tower - Suite 3600
 4 455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive
 Chicago, Illinois 60611
 5 Telephone: (312) 321-4200
 Facsimile: (312) 321-4299
 6
 Attorneys For Plaintiff
 7 OVERTURE SERVICES, INC.

8
 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP
 9 JOHN W. KEKER - #49092
 JON B. STREETER - #101970
 10 DARALYN J. DURIE - #169825
 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945
 11 710 Sansome Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
 12 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188
 13
 Attorneys for Defendant
 14 GOOGLE INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 OVERTURE SERVICES, INC., a Delaware
 20 corporation,
 21 Plaintiff,
 22 v.
 23 GOOGLE INC., a California corporation,
 24 Defendant.

Case No. C 02-01991 CRB ADR

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
 STATEMENT AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

26 On October 21, 2002, the Court entered a stipulated order staying Google's deadline for
 27 serving Preliminary Invalidity Contentions pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-3, as well as the other
 28 deadlines set by the Patent Local Rules, pending resolution by a Magistrate Judge of Google's

1 motion for an extension of time. The stipulated order further provided, “Within ten court days of
 2 the date of the order by the Magistrate Judge resolving Google’s motion, the parties shall file
 3 with the Court a joint case management statement addressing any scheduling modifications that
 4 may be necessary in light of the Magistrate Judge’s order.”

5 Magistrate Judge Laporte heard argument on Google’s motion on December 18, 2002.
 6 The Magistrate Judge ordered that, among other things, Overture should serve revised versions
 7 of its Preliminary Infringement contentions in part by January 14, 2003 and in part by January
 8 31, 2003, and that Google should serve its Preliminary Infringement Contentions by February 14,
 9 2003. The Magistrate Judge also entered a minute order later that day stating that Google’s
 10 motion had been granted. As directed by the Magistrate Judge, the parties met and conferred and
 11 reached an agreement as to form for a written order, and counsel for Google submitted the order
 12 to the Magistrate Judge by electronic mail on December 19, 2002, and by messenger on
 13 December 20, 2002. The written order has not yet entered, but the parties expect that it will
 14 enter shortly in the form agreed upon by the parties.

15 Based on the dates in Magistrate Judge Laporte’s ruling, the parties hereby jointly
 16 propose the following modifications to the case management schedule in this case:

17 Event	Patent L.R.	Old Date	New Date
18 Last Day for Simultaneous Exchange of Proposed 19 Terms and Claim Elements for Construction 20 and/or Governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 6	4-1	11/14/02	3/3/03
21 Last Day for Simultaneous Exchange of 22 Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence	4-2	12/4/02	3/24/03
23 Last Day for Parties to File Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement	4-3	12/30/02	4/15/03
24 Last Day to Take Discovery Relating to Claim 25 Construction	4-4	1/29/03	5/15/03
26 Last Day for Overture to File Opening Claim Construction Brief and Supporting Evidence	4-5	2/13/03	5/30/03
27 Last Day for Google to File Responsive Claim 28 Construction Brief and Supporting Evidence	4-5	2/27/03	6/13/03

Event	Patent L.R.	Old Date	New Date
Last Day for Overture to File Reply Claim Construction Brief and Rebuttal Evidence	4-5	3/10/03	6/24/03
Technology Tutorial for Court and Claim Construction Prehearing Conference		3/24/03	On or after 7/8/03
Claim Construction Hearing	4-6	3/25/03	On or after 7/9/03

If Magistrate Judge Laporte revises the order agreed upon by the parties prior to signing it, and if the changes necessitate further modifications to the case management schedule, the parties will submit a further joint case management schedule.

Dated: January 3, 2003

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

By: s/ Charles M. McMahon
 CHARLES M. MCMAHON
 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 OVERTURE SERVICES, INC.

Dated: January 3, 2003

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

By: s/ Michael S. Kwun
 MICHAEL S. KWUN
 Attorneys for Defendant
 GOOGLE INC.

Good cause appearing, the foregoing modifications to the case management schedule in this case are hereby adopted by the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

By: _____
 THE HON. CHARLES R. BREYER
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1 I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from
2 Charles M. McMahon.

3 Dated: January 3, 2003

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

4

5

By: s/ Michael S. Kwun
MICHAEL S. KWUN
Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28