1	1		
2	2		
3	3		
4	4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8	8		
9	<sup>9</sup> ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,	No. C 10-03561 WHA	
10	10 Plaintiff,		
11	11 v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION	
12	<sup>12</sup> GOOGLE INC.,	FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW AND NEW TRIAL	
13	13 Defendant.	Defendant.	
14	14/		
15	Defendant Google Inc. moves for judgment as a matter of law under Rule 50(b), or in the		
16	alternative, for a new trial under Rule 59, on copyright issues regarding the rangeCheck function		
17	and decompiled files. Google's arguments are repetitive of its Rule 50(a) motion and rely on the		
18	same evidence. For reasons stated in the prior orders (Dkt. Nos. 1119, 1123), Google's motion		
19	is <b>Denied</b> .		
20	The Court takes this opportunity to state that it will take no further action regarding the		
21	subject of payments by the litigants to commentators and journalists and reassures both sides that		
22	no commentary has in any way influenced the Court's orders and ruling herein save and except		
23	for any treatise or article expressly cited in an order or ruling.		
24			
25	II IS SO OKDERED.		
26		0.4	
27	Dated. September 4, 2012. $\overline{W_{III}}$	IAM ALSUP	
28	<sup>28</sup> UNIT	ED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	

Dockets.Justia.com