13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

## 1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5 6 7 ORACLE USA, INC., et al., 8 Plaintiffs, No. C 07-1658 PJH 9 **ORDER** ٧. SAP AG, et al., 10 11 Defendants. 12

The motion of plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., et al., ("Oracle") for clarification is DENIED, as the court does not agree that there is anything in the September 1, 2011 and September 16, 2011 orders that requires clarification. The court refers Oracle to the discussion in the September 1, 2011 order at 10-15. To the extent that the motion for clarification is intended as a motion for leave to seek reconsideration of the September 1, 2011 and September 16, 2011 orders, it is DENIED for failure to comply with the requirements of Civil Local Rule 7-9.

Oracle's motion for leave to seek reconsideration of the November 8, 2010 order excluding evidence of lost cross-sell and up-sell evidence, and motion for leave to seek reconsideration of the September 30, 2010 order excluding evidence of saved development costs, are DENIED as moot in light of the ruling on the motion for clarification, and also for failure to comply with the requirements of Civil Local Rule 7-9.

25

26

27

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 15, 2012

28

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Judge