

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
For the Northern District of CaliforniaIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYNOPSISYS, INC.,

No. C 12-6467 MMC

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION**

v.

MENTOR GRAPHICS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Before the Court is plaintiff's "Administrative Motion to Require Defendant to File Its Motion for Second Amended Invalidity Contentions with the Court," filed February 19, 2014. Defendant has filed opposition thereto. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the instant administrative motion, the Court rules as follows.


Pursuant to the Court's order filed November 26, 2013, all discovery matters were referred to Magistrate Judge Donna M. Ryu. On February 19, 2014, defendant filed with Judge Ryu a letter brief requesting leave to amend its invalidity contentions. Thereafter, plaintiff filed the instant administrative motion, in which plaintiff requests that the matter presented in the letter brief be considered by the Court in the first instance. Although, as plaintiff points out, the Court determined without a reference defendant's previous Motion for Leave to Amend Invalidity Contentions, said motion was filed on October 14, 2013, over a month before the Court referred all discovery matters to Judge Ryu. At this stage of the proceedings, the Court finds it preferable that such motions to amend, which pertain to the

1 subject of discovery, be heard in the first instance by Judge Ryu.

2 Accordingly, the Court declines to withdraw the reference with respect to defendant's
3 motion to amend, and plaintiff's administrative motion is hereby DENIED.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: February 24, 2014


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28