

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYNOPSISYS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
ATOPTTECH, INC.,
Defendant.

No. C-13-2965 MMC

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT; SETTING DEADLINE FOR DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT

Before the Court is plaintiff Synopsys, Inc.'s ("Synopsys") "Motion for Leave (A) to File Supplemental Complaint and (B) to File Motion for Reconsideration," filed January 11, 2016. Defendant ATopTech, Inc. ("ATopTech") has filed opposition, to which Synopsys has replied.¹ The matter came on for hearing on January 22, 2016. Robert A. Mittelstaedt, Patrick T. Michael, Krista S. Schwartz, and Matthew J. Silveira of Jones Day appeared on behalf of Synopsys. Paul Alexander and Sean M. Callagy of Arnold & Porter LLP appeared

¹On January 20, 2016, ATopTech filed an "Objection to Reply Evidence and Motion for Leave to File Sur-Reply in Opposition to Synopsys' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Complaint and to File Motion for Reconsideration." On the record at the January 22, 2016, hearing, the Court granted the leave requested.

1 on behalf of ATopTech. Having considered the parties' respective written submissions, and
2 the arguments of counsel at the hearing, the Court rules as follows.


3 1. To the extent plaintiff seeks leave to file the proposed supplemental complaint,
4 the motion, for the reasons stated by the Court on the record at the hearing, is hereby
5 GRANTED.

6 2. To the extent plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Court's Order, filed January 7,
7 2016, the motion, for the reasons stated by the Court on the record at the hearing, is
8 hereby DENIED.

9 3. As discussed with the parties at the hearing, the deadline for ATopTech to file its
10 response to the supplemental complaint is January 29, 2016; if the response is a motion,
11 the opposition is due no later than February 3, 2016, the reply is due no later than February
12 4, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., and the matter will be heard on February 5, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: January 22, 2016


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28