

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYMANTEC CORPORATION,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
ACRONIS, INC., *et al.*,  
  
Defendants.

No. C-11-5310 EMC

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS’  
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S ORDER OF  
DECEMBER 28, 2012**  
  
**(Docket No. 173)**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Acronis has moved for relief from Judge Corley’s order of December 28, 2012. Under federal law, “[a] non-dispositive order entered by a magistrate [judge] must be deferred to unless it is ‘clearly erroneous or contrary to law.’” *Grimes v. City & County of San Francisco*, 951 F.2d 236, 241 (9th Cir. 1991). When a district court reviews a magistrate judge’s order, it “may not simply substitute its judgment for that of the [magistrate judge].” *Id.* Because Acronis has failed to show that Judge Corley’s order was clearly erroneous or that it was contrary to law, its motion for relief is hereby **DENIED**.

This order disposes of Docket No. 173.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 4, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge