

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

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

ADVANCED ANALOGIC TECHNOLOGIES,
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

KINETIC TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant

No. C-09-1360 MMC

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONTINUE HEARING AND BRIEFING
SCHEDULE; VACATING DECEMBER 18,
2009 HEARING**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Advanced Analogic Technologies, Inc.'s ("AATI") "Administrative Motion to Continue Hearing and Briefing Schedule on KTI's Motion to Stay Pending Inter Parties Reexamination," filed November 19, 2009, by which AATI seeks to continue, from December 18, 2009 to January 8, 2010, the hearing date on defendant Kinetic Technologies, Inc.'s ("KTI") motion to stay the above-titled action, pending the Patent and Trademark Office's decision on KTI's pending request for reexamination. KTI has filed opposition to the instant administrative motion. Having read and considered the papers submitted in support of and in opposition to the administrative motion, the Court rules as follows.


In order to accommodate AATI's counsel's unavailability on December 18, 2009, and to accommodate KTI's concerns that, between December 18, 2009 and January 8, 2010, the parties, in order to comply with the claim construction schedule previously set by the

1 Court, will have to devote time and resources that may be unnecessary should the Court
2 grant the motion to stay, the Court finds it appropriate to retain the current briefing schedule
3 on the motion to stay, and to take the motion to stay under submission as of the date on
4 which the reply is presently due, specifically, December 4, 2009.

5 Accordingly, the December 18, 2009 hearing is hereby VACATED.¹

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: November 20, 2009


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

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

¹Should the Court, upon review of the parties' respective submissions with respect to the motion to stay, find oral argument is necessary, the Court will so inform the parties.