

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 KILOPASS TECHNOLOGY INC,

No. C 10-02066 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER CORRECTING FEB. 8, 2011
ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO STAY PENDING INTER
PARTES REEXAMINATION**


10 v.

11 SIDENSE CORPORATION,

12 Defendant.
13 _____/

14 On February 8, 2011, the Court issued an Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Stay Pending
15 Inter Partes Reexamination. Doc. 76. At page 6, lines 6-7, the order stated: "Although the factors for
16 the Court to consider in this case do not weigh greatly in favor of one side or the other, on balance the
17 factors weigh in favor of defendant." The order is hereby CORRECTED to state: "Although the factors
18 for the Court to consider in this case do not weigh greatly in favor of one side or the other, on balance
19 the factors weigh in favor of plaintiff."
20

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**22
23 Dated: February 11, 2011

24 

25 SUSAN ILLSTON
26 United States District Judge
27
28