## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Apple Computer	Inc.,	
	Plaintiff(s),	CASE NO. 06-00019
Burst.com, Inc.,	v.	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS
	Defendant(s).	
	el report that they have met a ulation pursuant to Civil L.R	and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:
The parties ag	ree to participate in the follo	owing ADR process:
√ (Note: Parties appreciably m ADR phone CADR Phone CA	ore likely to meet their need onference and may not file to onference. See Civil Local R e <b>Process:</b>	ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)  ettlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is ls than any other form of ADR, must participate in an his form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for
	referring the case to an AD	by: The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order PR process unless otherwise ordered.)
Dated: 3/28/06		/s/ Nicholas A. Brown Attorney for Plaintiff
Dated: 3/28/06		/s/ Colby B. Springer Attorney for Defendant

Purs	nuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:  Non-binding Arbitration Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) Mediation Private ADR	
Dea <b>√</b>	dline for ADR session 90 days from the date of this order. other	
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated:		

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE