

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

RICHTEK TECHNOLOGY
CORPORATION and RICHTEK USA, INC.,

No. C 09-05659 WHA

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ORDER REGARDING
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

UPI SEMICONDUCTOR
CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

On November 12, 2010, a group of seventeen defendants represented by Haynes and Boone, LLP filed four separate motions to dismiss. The motions were made on the following bases: (1) lack of personal jurisdiction; (2) lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, or in the alternative, forum non conveniens; (3) improper venue pursuant to a forum selection agreement; and (4) lack of standing. Two other defendants represented by two other law firms have joined the latter three motions. All four motions have been fully briefed and are set for hearing on December 23, 2010.

Filing the motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction as a separate motion was acceptable, but the other three motions should have been consolidated into a single pleading. The exact same group of seventeen defendants submitted each motion, and a single law firm represents all of these movants. Under these circumstances, the submission of four separate


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

motions to dismiss appears to be a scheme for circumnavigating the page limits imposed by the Civil Local Rules.

Movants are directed to file a summary of the latter three motions to dismiss no later than **NOON ON DECEMBER 21, 2010**. This summary may not exceed ten pages and may not contain new material but must provide a synopsis of the voluminous briefing filed on these three motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 17, 2010.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE