

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**

SYNOPSIS, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

MENTOR GRAPHICS CORPORATION, an Oregon Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:12-cv-06467-MMC-DMR

**GRANTING IN PART AND
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER DENYING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF
MENTOR'S REPLY BRIEF
REGARDING MENTOR'S DAUBERT
MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY
OF MARY WOODFORD, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE FOR PERMISSION TO
FILE A SUR-REPLY**


~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF MENTOR'S REPLY BRIEF REGARDING MENTOR'S DAUBERT MOTION
CASE NO. 3:12-CV-06467-MMC

1 Plaintiff Synopsys, Inc. (“Synopsys”) filed its Administrative Motion To Strike
2 Portions Of Mentor’s Reply Brief Regarding Mentor’s *Daubert* Motion To Exclude
3 Testimony Of Mary Woodford, Or In The Alternative For Permission To File A Sur-
4 Reply (“Motion”) (Dkt. No. 359); Mentor Graphics Corporation filed its Response
5 thereto on November 4, 2014 (“Response”). After fully considering the Motion and
6 Response thereto, Synopsys’s Motion is DENIED-IN-PART and GRANTED-IN-
7 PART.

8 Synopsys may file a sur-reply on the issue of whether Ms. Woodford’s
9 testimony is conclusory regarding *Panduit* factor 2 (Dkt. No. 359-3 at 3:3-13)
10 because Mentor does not oppose that portion of Synopsys’s Motion. The remainder
11 of Synopsys’s request to file a sur-reply is denied because Mentor adequately raised
12 Synopsys’s discovery failures in its opening motion (Dkt. No. 290-3).

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16 Dated: November 5, 2014

17 
18 Honorable Maxine M. Chesley
19 United States District Court Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27