

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 TO  
SHOW CAUSE**

UPI SEMICONDUCTOR  
CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

This action is the *fifth* in a series legal actions addressing the same affair. Plaintiffs have initiated civil, criminal, and injunctive actions in Taiwan and also have convinced the United States International Trade Commission to institute an investigation on their behalf. These other actions were brought against various subsets of the defendants named here and address essentially the same set of grievances voiced here. Plaintiffs have settled their ITC dispute with each of the several companies named as respondents, but the Taiwanese actions remain pending.


This action's factual center of gravity is Taiwan. The vast majority of the parties, witnesses, documents, and other evidence are located in Taiwan, and the alleged illegal acts were committed in Taiwan. To avoid what may quickly become a burdensome and unnecessary duplication of judicial efforts, it seems appropriate to stay this action pending the outcome of the Taiwanese actions. Any party that disagrees is directed to show cause why this action should not

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

be stayed by **NOON ON JANUARY 6, 2011**. In particular, the parties are requested to identify the patents asserted in the Taiwanese civil and injunctive actions and address the relationship between these Taiwanese patents and the U.S. patents asserted here.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: January 3, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE