1	
2	
3	
4	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	
8	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., No. C 10-03561 WHA
9	Plaintiff,
10	v. SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER
11	GOOGLE INC., REGARDING PATENT MARKING
12	Defendant.
13	
14	A prior order requested the parties' response to the Court's proposed plan regarding patent
15	marking (Dkt. No. 636). Oracle filed its response and sought to add a new feature to the plan:
16	Google should identify products in Oracle's submission that Google contends do not practice the
17	claims, in addition to identifying further products that practice the claims (Dkt. No. 638). The
18	deadline in the prior order has passed and Google has not yet filed a response. Counsel for
19	Google shall please comment on the Court's proposed plan and also address the additional feature
20	that Oracle has suggested by <b>NOON TODAY</b> .
21	
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.
23	$\sim 10^{-10}$
24	Dated: December 5, 2011. WILLIAM ALSUP
25 26	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26	
27	
28	