1	Robert A. Mittelstaedt (SBN 60359)		Jeffrey A. Miller (SBN 160602) Deborah E. Fishman (SBN 197584)
2	ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com Krista S. Schwartz (Admitted <i>Pro Ha</i>	ıc Vice)	Katie J.L. Scott (SBN 233171)
3	ksschwartz@jonesday.com Joe C. Liu (SBN 237356)		Assad H. Rajani (SBN 251143) Michael S. Tonkinson (SBN 265011)
4	jcliu@jonesday.com Nathaniel P. Garrett (SBN 248211)		DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP 1841 Page Mill Road, Suite 150
5	ngarrett@jonesday.com JONES DAY		Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: (650) 690-9500
6	555 California Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104		Facsimile: (650) 690-9501 millerj@dicksteinshapiro.com
7	Telephone: (415) 626-3939 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700		fishmand@dicksteinshapiro.com scottk@dicksteinshapiro.com
			rajania@dicksteinshapiro.com
8	Patrick T. Michael (SBN 169745) pmichael@jonesday.com		tonkinsonm@dicksteinshapiro.com
9	Heather N. Fugitt (SBN 261588) hfugitt@jonesday.com		Paul G. Novak (SBN 261388) DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
10	JONES DAY 1755 Embarcadero Road		2049 Century Park East, Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90067
11	Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 739-3939		Telephone: (310) 772-8300 Facsimile: (310) 772-8301
12	Facsimile: (650) 739-3900		novakp@dicksteinshapiro.com
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff		Attorneys for Defendant
14	SYNOPSYS, INC.		ATOPTECH, INC.
15			
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
19			
20	SYNOPSYS, INC.,	Case No.	3:13-cv-02965-MMC (DMR)
21	Plaintiff,	STIPULA	ATION AND <del>[PROPOSED]</del> ORDER
22	v.	STAYING PENDING	G PATENT ČLAIMS (COÚNTS II –V) G <i>INTER PARTES</i> REVIEW
23	ATOPTECH, INC.,	Date:	August 15, 2014
24	Defendants.	Time: Judge:	9:00 a.m. Hon. Maxine M. Chesney
25		Courtroo	m: 7, 19 <sup>th</sup> Floor
26			
27			
28			
			STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER STAYING PATENT CLAIMS Case No. 3:13-cv-02965-MMC (DMR)

Case No. 3:13-cv-02965-MMC (DMR)

respective counsel of record, that: 1. Synopsys's patent claims (Counts II - V) are stayed pending the PTAB's decision 3 on whether to institute *inter partes* review of the Patents-in-Suit (the "Partial Stay"). Synopsys 4 will serve ATopTech with its identification of asserted claims for each of the Patents-in-Suit on or 5 before August 8, 2014, but all other deadlines pursuant to the Patent Local Rules are suspended. 6 The August 15, 2014 hearing date for Defendant's Motion to Stay Patent Claims Pending *Inter* 7 Partes Review (ECF No. 136) is vacated. 8 2. The Parties shall jointly file a status report within 10 days of the date after the 9 PTAB's decision whether to grant *inter partes* review. In the event that none of the *inter partes* 10 review petitions are granted, the stay of Synopsys's patent claims will be automatically lifted. In the event fewer than all of the petitions are granted, the parties shall jointly discuss whether they 12 believe the Partial Stay should be lifted or modified and shall apprise the Court of their respective positions. Should the PTAB institute *inter partes* review on all four of the Patents-in-Suit, the 14 Partial Stay shall remain in effect until the PTAB issues a final written decision on all instituted 15 inter partes review proceedings. 16 3. If the Partial Stay remains in place following the grant of some or all of the *inter* 17 partes review petitions, the Parties shall jointly file a status report within 10 days of the date on 18 which the last of the PTAB's final written decision is rendered on the *inter partes* reviews. Upon 19 notice of issuance of the PTAB's final written decision to the Court, the stay is lifted subject to 20 further order of the Court. 4. This Order is without prejudice to either party filing a motion to lift the stay upon 22 a showing of good cause. 23 5. The Partial Stay will not include any of the non-patent claims (Counts I, VI and 24 VII), nor shall it disturb the schedule for the pending Motion to Disqualify Dickstein Shapiro LLP.

26

25

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

21

1

2

11

13

27

28

1	Dated: July 22, 2014	Respectfully submitted,	
2		JONES DAY	
3			
4		By: /s/ Patrick T. Michael	
5		Patrick T. Michael	
6		Attorneys for Plaintiff SYNOPSYS, INC.	
7	In accordance with Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the above signatory attests that concurrence in		
8	the filing of this document has been obtained from the signatory below.		
9	Dated: July 22, 2014	DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO	
10			
11		By: /s/ Deborah E. Fishman Deborah E. Fishman	
12			
13		Attorneys for Defendant ATOPTECH, INC.	
14			
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
16	DATED: July 22, 2014	By: Makine M. Chesney  Hon. Maxine M. Chesney	
17		Hon. Maxine M. Chesney	
18			
19	SVI-149513v1		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	