

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
GOOGLE INC.,  
Defendant.

No. C 10-03561 WHA

**ORDER REGARDING  
PATENT MARKING**

Having read the parties' letters dated November 30, 2011, counsel are requested to show cause by **5:00 PM TOMORROW** why the following procedure should not be adopted in order to streamline and manage the trial.


Counsel for Oracle shall identify, for each of the 26 asserted claims, each Oracle product, Oracle-licensed product, Sun product, or Sun-licensed product that practiced the claim during the alleged damages period from January 1, 2007 through July 20, 2010, the time of actual notice. This must be filed by **DECEMBER 16, 2011**. In making this submission, counsel shall keep in mind that they are officers of the court and full candor is required.

By **DECEMBER 30, 2011**, counsel for Google shall respond and identify any further products by Oracle or Sun that practiced any of the 26 asserted claims, specifying with particularity which ones and why. Counsel shall keep in mind that they are officers of the court and full candor is required. Mere allegations will not suffice. Google will only list products they can prove practiced the asserted claims.

1 After reviewing these submissions, the Court will determine the appropriate next steps.

2  
3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4  
5 Dated: December 1, 2011.

6   
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 WILLIAM ALSUP  
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE