

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

VERINATA HEALTH, INC., et al.,

No. C 12-00865 SI

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE: CLARIFICATION OF
NUMBER OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT
MOTIONS TO BE FILED**

v.

SEQUENOM, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

On September 25, 2014, the Court issued an order in response to the parties' administrative motions to file multiple summary judgment motions. The Court concluded that "The parties – Sequenom, CUHK, and Verinata – shall each submit a single motion for summary judgment." Docket No. 247 at 2. On September 30, 2014, Verinata filed a letter asking for clarification on the Court's order, and on October 3, 2014 Sequenom and CUHK filed a response. Docket Nos. 248, 249. In its letter, Verinata states that "[w]hile it thus seems clear that Stanford may still file its own summary judgment motion . . . out of an abundance of caution Plaintiffs seek confirmation from the Court that this is so." Docket No. 248 at 1.

Verinata's reading of the Court's order is incorrect. The order stated that "Sequenom, CUHK, and Verinata" would each file a single motion for summary judgment. The second sentence of the Court's order defines "Verinata" to mean "Verinata Health, Inc. and the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University." Docket No. 247. Therefore, in response to Verinata's request for clarification:

- 1 1. Verinata and Stanford may file a combined total of one summary judgment motion.
- 2 2. CUHK may file one summary judgment motion.
- 3 3. Sequenom may file one summary judgment motion.

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

This order resolves Docket Nos. 248, 249.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 20, 2014



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge