

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE CORPORATION, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
SAP AG, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C-07-01658 PJH (EDL)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY OR
EXTEND TIME TO COMPLY WITH
JULY 3, 2008 ORDER**

On July 3, 2008, the Court ordered Defendants to produce documents submitted to the grand jury no later than July 15, 2008. On July 13, 2008, the parties filed a stipulated request to extend that deadline to July 23, 2008, which the Court granted on July 17, 2008. On July 18, 2008, Defendants filed objections to the Court's July 3, 2008 Order with Judge Hamilton. Also on July 18, 2008, Defendants filed a motion seeking a stay or an additional extension of time to comply with the July 3, 2008 order until seven days after Judge Hamilton's disposition of the objections. Plaintiff opposed Defendants' motion for stay or extension of time, focusing on the delay that has already occurred, and will continue to occur, in production of these documents if a stay is granted.

The Court has carefully reviewed the parties' submissions and finds that there is good cause for a brief stay of the Court's July 3, 2008 Order. Accordingly, Defendants' compliance with the order is stayed until one day after Judge Hamilton either: (1) denies Defendants' objections by express order; (2) allows fifteen days to elapse without action, thereby deeming the objections

//
//

1 denied; or (3) sustains Defendants' objections, whichever occurs first.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: July 22, 2008

Elizabeth D. Laporte

4 ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
5 United States Magistrate Judge

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28