

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  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

ASUS COMPUTER INT’L,  
  
                                Plaintiff,  
  
                                v.  
  
ROUND ROCK RESEARCH, LLC,  
  
                                Defendant.

Case No. 12-cv-02099 JST (NC)

**ORDER OF CLARIFICATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 145, 146, 147

Plaintiff seeks clarification from the Court regarding its November 20, 2013, order resolving discovery disputes in this patent infringement action. Dkt. No. 146. In that order, the Court required the parties to “mutually exchange infringement and non-infringement contentions.” Dkt. No. 145 at 4. ASUS asks the Court to clarify that the Court’s order requires the parties to supplement their responses to “outstanding contention interrogatories” rather than “contentions.” Dkt. No. 146.

The Court’s order addressed Round Rock’s request to compel ASUS to supplement its response to Round Rock Interrogatory No. 6, which asks ASUS to “identify all factual and legal bases for ASUS’s contention that each such product does not infringe the Patents-in-Suit directly ... and/or indirectly.” Dkt. No. 121-4. The Court’s order granted Round

1 Rock's request. But the Court also found that the exchange of information should be  
2 mutual, and therefore ordered Round Rock to similarly identify the bases for its  
3 infringement contentions. That information is requested in ASUS Interrogatory No. 7,  
4 which asked that Round Rock identify "the basis for your contention that the asserted  
5 claims are valid...." Dkt. No. 121-8. To clarify, the Court's order required ASUS to  
6 supplement its response to Round Rock Interrogatory No. 6, and required Round Rock to  
7 supplement its response to ASUS Interrogatory No. 7.

8 The Court also reminds the parties of their obligation to meet and confer in an attempt  
9 to resolve discovery disputes, including interpretation of discovery orders, prior to seeking  
10 the Court's intervention. *See* Civil L.R. 37-1(a).

11 Any party may object to this order within 14 days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Date: December 3, 2013

14 

15 

---

Nathanael M. Cousins  
16 United States Magistrate Judge