

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYNOPSIS INC,

No. C-12-06467 DMR

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER FOR SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEFING**

v.

MENTOR GRAPHICS CORP,

Defendant(s).

On November 21, 2013, Defendant Mentor Graphics Corp. filed a motion for entry of protective order. [Docket No. 107.] Judge Chesney referred the motion and all further discovery matters to this court, and ordered Mentor to meet and confer with Plaintiff Synopsis Inc. and prepare a joint discovery letter explaining the dispute. [Docket No. 110.] The parties filed a joint discovery letter on December 12, 2013. [Docket No. 113.] The hearing on the joint discovery letter is set for January 23, 2014.

Having reviewed the joint discovery letter, the court has determined that supplemental briefing is necessary to explain the actual, non-speculative impact of proceeding in this case with a prosecution bar. Accordingly, each party shall submit separate additional briefing by **12 p.m. on January 17, 2014**, addressing the following: (1) the extent to which the issues have overlapped or will overlap in this case and the Oregon cases; (2) the extent to which discovery has overlapped or will overlap in this case and the Oregon cases; (3) the names of counsel participating in each of the

1 cases on behalf of the party, including an indication of whether that attorney is outside counsel or in-
2 house and the extent to which that attorney is involved in competitive decisionmaking relating to the
3 subject matter of the litigations; (4) the potential difficulty the party has faced and/or realistically
4 might face if limited to certain counsel for the pending litigation or required to engage other counsel
5 for purposes of patent prosecution; (5) the subject matter of the invention in this case, as
6 differentiated from the subject matters of the inventions in the Oregon cases, and (6) the subject
7 matter of the highly confidential technical information produced or to be produced in this case, as
8 differentiated from the highly confidential technical information produced or to be produced in the
9 Oregon cases. Each submission shall be restricted to **six double-spaced pages**.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: January 14, 2014

