

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

6
7 VIGILOS, LLC,
8 Plaintiff,

No. C 11-06240 WHA

No. C 11-04117 SBA

9 v.

**ORDER REGARDING
FEBRUARY 3 SUBMISSION**

10 FORA CARE, INC.,
11 Defendant.
12 _____/

13 Only plaintiff Vigilos, LLC responded to the January 31 order requesting additional
14 information regarding the motion to relate. Plaintiff's response was inadequate. By **NOON ON**
15 **FEBRUARY 8**, plaintiff shall please submit a more detailed disclosure stating *exactly* which patent
16 claims are being asserted against *each* defendant and whether there are discrepancies. Plaintiff
17 shall also submit a more detailed description of the allegedly infringing products and defendants'
18 relationship with each other regarding the products.

19 The January 31 order requested "the parties" to explain the nature of the allegedly
20 infringing products. Defendants in both the *Sling Media* action (Case No. 4:11-cv-04117-SBA)
21 and the above-captioned action failed to respond to the January 31 order. By **NOON ON**
22 **FEBRUARY 8**, defendants shall submit a description of the allegedly infringing products and
23 defendants' relationship with each other regarding the products.

24
25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 Dated: February 6, 2012.

28 

WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE