

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

TESSERA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a
Delaware corporation; SPANSION,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability
corporation; SPANSION, INC., a
Delaware corporation; SPANSION
TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Delaware
corporation; ADVANCED
SEMICONDUCTOR ENGINEERING, INC.,
a Republic of China corporation;
ASE (U.S.), INC., a California
corporation; CHIPMOS
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Republic of
China corporation; CHIPMOS
U.S.A., INC., a California
corporation; SILICONWARE
PRECISION INDUSTRIES CO., LTD., a
Republic of China corporation;
SILICONWARE USA, INC., a
California corporation;
STMICROELECTRONICS N.V., a
Netherlands corporation;
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC., a
Delaware corporation; STATS
CHIPPAC, INC., a Delaware
corporation; STATS CHIPPAC (BVI),
INC., a British Virgin Islands
company; STATS CHIPPAC, LTD., a
Singapore company,

Defendants.

SILICONWARE PRECISION INDUSTRIES
CO, LTD; SILICONWARE U.S.A.,
INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TESSERA, INC.,

Defendant.

No. C 05-4063 CW

ORDER MODIFYING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE
FOR LICENSE-BASED
SUMMARY JUDGMENT
MOTIONS

No. C 08-3667 CW

1 CHIPMOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
2 CHIPMOS U.S.A., INC.; CHIPMOS
3 TECHNOLOGIES (BERMUDA), LTD.,

No. C 08-3827 CW

4 Plaintiffs,

5 v.

6 TESSERA, INC.,

7 Defendant.
8 _____/

9 ADVANCED SEMICONDUCTOR
10 ENGINEERING, INC.; ASE TEST
11 LIMITED; ASE (U.S.), INC.,

No. C 08-3726 CW

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 TESSERA, INC.,

15 Defendant.
16 _____/

17 SPANSION, INC., et al.,

No. C 10-4954 CW

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 TESSERA, INC.,

21 Claimant.
22 _____/

23 POWERTECH TECHNOLOGY INC.,

No. C 10-945 CW

24 Plaintiff,

25 v.

26 TESSERA, INC.,

27 Defendant.
28 _____/

1 POWERTECH TECHNOLOGY INC., No. C 11-6121 CW
2 Plaintiff,
3 v.
4 TESSERA, INC.,
5 Defendant.

6 _____/
7 TESSERA, INC., No. C 12-692 CW
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 QUALCOMM, INC.; FREESCALE
11 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.; ATI
12 TECHNOLOGIES, ULC,
13 Defendants.

14 _____/
15 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS
16 _____/

17 Having considered Powertech Technology, Inc.'s motion for
18 clarification, the Court finds good cause to revise the current
19 briefing schedule on the license-based summary judgment motions in
20 the above-captioned cases to allow for cross-motions for summary
21 judgment. Accordingly, the Court sets the following schedule:

| <u>Event</u> | <u>Date</u> |
|--|-------------------------|
| Deadline for Defendants ¹ to file their license-based motions for summary judgment. To the extent possible, Defendants shall file a single joint brief on behalf of more than one, or all, Defendants, with separate sections to address individual differences as needed. | Thursday, July 19, 2012 |

26 _____
27 ¹ In this Order, the Court uses the term Defendants to refer
28 to the parties opposing Tessera, Inc. in each case.


| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| 1 2 3 | Deadline for Tessera, Inc. to file its license-based cross-motion for summary judgment, if any, and opposition to Defendants' motions. Tessera, Inc. shall address these matters in a single brief. | Thursday, August 9, 2012 |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | Deadline for Defendants to file their replies in support of their motions for summary judgment and their opposition to Tessera, Inc.'s cross-motion. The reply and opposition shall be addressed in the same brief. To the extent possible, Defendants shall file a single joint brief on behalf of more than one, or all, Defendants, with separate sections as needed. | Thursday, August 23, 2012 |
| 9 | Deadline for Tessera, Inc. to file its reply in support of its cross-motion. | Thursday, August 30, 2012 |
| 10 11 12 | Hearing on license-based motions for summary judgment | Thursday, September 20, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. |

13 The Court will entertain a stipulation to change the briefing
14 schedule, provided that the parties maintain the same schedule in
15 all of the above-captioned cases, that opposing briefs are filed
16 in series as described above, not contemporaneously, with as
17 little repetition as possible, and that the parties' briefing is
18 completed at least three weeks prior to the hearing date.

19 This Order resolves Docket No. 104 in Case No. 11-6121.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21
22 Dated: 6/15/2012

21
22 
23 CLAUDIA WILKEN
24 United States District Judge