



1 Plaintiff Cepheid filed this declaratory judgment action on August 21, 2012, seeking, *inter*  
2 *alia*, a declaration that the claims of U.S. Patent Nos. 5,804,375 (“the ’375 patent”) and 6,127,155  
3 (“the ’155 patent”) are not infringed, are invalid, and are otherwise unenforceable. Defendant Roche  
4 Molecular Systems, Inc. moved to stay Counts I and II related to the ’375 patent pending final  
5 resolution of a Swiss arbitration between the parties and moved to dismiss Counts III and IV related  
6 to the ’155 patent for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. On January 17, 2013, the Court issued its  
7 Order Granting Defendant’s Motion to Stay and Motion to Dismiss (“Order”). ECF No. 68. The  
8 Court stayed Counts I and II until further order of this Court and dismissed Counts III and IV for  
9 lack of subject matter jurisdiction. With respect to Counts I and II, the Court directed the parties to  
10 “update this Court within 30 days of the issuance of the Arbitral Tribunal’s decision on the issue of  
11 jurisdiction.” *Id.* at 8.

12 Pursuant to the Order, the parties notified the Court that on August 1, 2013, the International  
13 Chamber of Commerce (ICC) International Court of Arbitration issued a letter notifying the parties  
14 that the Arbitral Tribunal had rendered a Partial Award on arbitral jurisdiction, dated July 30, 2013.  
15 ECF No. 77. The Partial Award included an order concerning jurisdiction, in which the Arbitral  
16 Tribunal concluded that it has jurisdiction to decide on the relief sought by the claimants (i.e., Roche  
17 Molecular Systems, Inc. and F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd). Cepheid appealed the Arbitral Tribunal’s  
18 jurisdictional decision. *Id.* On February 28, 2014 the Swiss Federal Court dismissed Cepheid’s  
19 appeal in its entirety. On April 20, 2016 the Arbitral Tribunal issued a second Partial Award on  
20 liability issues. The Arbitration is proceeding in accordance with the schedule set by the Arbitral  
21 Tribunal.

22 Since the Court issued its January 2013 Order, the parties have jointly filed several  
23 stipulations to continue the Initial Case Management Conference and the Court has entered those  
24 stipulations. Specifically, on March 11, 2013, the Court reset the Case Management Conference  
25 from March 14, 2013 to June 20, 2013 (ECF Nos. 72, 73); on June 7, 2013 the Court reset the Case  
26 Management Conference from June 20, 2013 to October 10, 2013 (ECF Nos. 74, 75); on September  
27 23, 2013 the Court reset the Case Management Conference from October 10, 2013 to March 6, 2014  
28 (ECF Nos. 77, 78); on February 26, 2014 the Court reset the Case Management Conference from

1 March 6, 2014 to November 13, 2014 (ECF Nos. 81, 82); on November 7, 2014 the Court reset the  
2 Case Management Conference from November 13, 2014 to March 26, 2015 (ECF Nos. 84, 85); on  
3 March 13, 2015 the Court reset the Case Management Conference from March 26, 2015 to  
4 September 24, 2015 (ECF Nos. 86, 87), ), which was reset *sua sponte* to September 23, 2015 (ECF  
5 No. 88); on September 16, 2015, the Court reset the Case Management Conference from September  
6 23, 2015 to April 21, 2016 (ECF Nos. 89, 90), on April 14, 2016, the Court reset the Case  
7 Management Conference from April 21, 2016 to October 27, 2016 (ECF Nos. 92, 93), which the  
8 Court then rescheduled *sua sponte* to November 8, 2016 (ECF No. 94); on November 3, 2016 the  
9 Court reset the Case Management Conference from November 8, 2016 to June 15, 2017 (ECF Nos.  
10 96, 97); on June 8, 2017 the Court reset the Case Management Conference from June 15, 2017 to  
11 November 16, 2017 (ECF Nos. 99, 100, 101); and on November 9, 2017 the Court reset the Case  
12 Management Conference from November 16, 2017 to March 1, 2018 (ECF Nos. 102, 103).

13 As of this time, the parties continue to believe that it is not appropriate to lift the Court's stay.  
14 Specifically, although the Arbitral Tribunal has issued its Final Award, the parties are in discussions  
15 that potentially can resolve their dispute.

16 Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that the Initial Case Management Conference,  
17 currently scheduled for March 1, 2018, be continued until June 7, 2018, or any other date that the  
18 Court deems appropriate. The parties will contact the Court before then if anything of substance  
19 occurs in the arbitration that may affect the status of this case.

20 By his signature below, Counsel for Plaintiff certifies that Counsel for Defendants concur in  
21 the filing of this notice.

22  
23 Dated: February 21, 2018

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

/s/ Erik R. Puknys

Erik R. Puknys  
Attorney for Plaintiff Cepheid

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

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP

/s/ Robert J. Gunther, Jr.  
Robert J. Gunther, Jr.  
Attorney for Defendant F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd.

HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP

/s/ Stephen S. Rabinowitz  
Stephen S. Rabinowitz  
Attorney for Defendant Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.

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

~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER

Pursuant to the stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing therefore;  
the CMC is reset from 3/1/18 to 6/7/18 at 9:30 a.m. A joint CMC  
statement shall be filed by 5/31/18.  
**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 2/28/18

