1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
o 9	
10	
11	PLANTRONICS, INC., No. C 09-01714 WHA
12	Plaintiff,
13	V. NOTICE CONCERNING JANUARY 9 ORAL ARGUMENT REGARDING MOTION IN LIMINE
14	ALIPH, INC., et al, Defendants. MOTION IN LIMINE REGARDING DR. LEONARD
15	/
16	On December 9, plaintiff moved to exclude portions of and testimony from Dr. Leonard
17	regarding the Freebit license and Freebit technology. The Court is tentatively of the view that
18	Dr. Leonard should not be able to opine at trial regarding whether the Freebit technology is a
19	substantial non-infringing alternative, but at most, should be permitted to assume that it is a
20	substantial non-infringing alternative. In which case, defendants must have different proof for
21	whether the Freebit technology is a substantial non-infringing alternative. At the January 9
22	hearing, defendants' counsel should please be prepared to demonstrate or address whether there
23	is such proof.
24	
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	

<sup>27</sup> Dated: January 7, 2014.

28

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dockets.Justia.com

United States District Court For the Northern District of California