Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. v. O2Micro International Limited

Doc. 302

1	
2	a
3	(
4	
5	(
6	(
7	Ι
8	Ι
9	
10	a
11	
12	u
13	
14	ť
15	
16	p
17	d
18	(
19	
20	(
21	
22	
23	

WHEREAS, Defendant and Counterclaimant O2 Micro International Limited ("O2 Micro")
asserts it has good cause to serve "Final Infringement Contentions" as a result of the Court's Claim
Construction Order (Docket No. 285); and

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. ("MPS") and Counterclaim Defendants ASUSTEK Computer Inc. and Asus Computer International (collectively "ASUS") will not dispute O2 Micro's assertion, but assert their right to serve Final Invalidity Contentions in light of the Court's Claim Construction Order and O2 Micro's "Final Infringement Contentions"; and

WHEREAS, O2 Micro submitted its proposed "Final Infringement Contentions" to the Court as part of its March 25, 2010 "Motion to Serve Final Infringement Contentions"; and

WHEREAS, O2 Micro has confirmed that it is not pursuing a theory of infringement based upon the Doctrine of Equivalents as to any patent claim or any accused product; and

WHEREAS, MPS and ASUS intend to serve their "Final Invalidity Contentions" within twenty-one (21) days from the date the Court approves this stipulation; and

WHEREAS, MPS and ASUS do not intend to assert new prior art, *i.e.*, prior art that has not previously been identified by way of their preliminary invalidity contentions, in expert reports, at depositions, and/or during the course of the ITC proceeding, as part of their "Final Invalidity Contentions"; and

WHEREAS, the parties will not seek to reopen discovery as a result of their respective Final Contentions.

IT IS STIPULATED that:

- (1) The Final Infringement Contentions that O2 Micro submitted to the Court on March 25, 2010 shall be deemed its final infringement contentions;
- (2) MPS and ASUS shall serve their Final Invalidity Contentions within twentyone (21) days of the date this Court approves this stipulation; and
- (3) These Final Contentions shall not be a reason for any party to ask that discovery be reopened.

/ / /

24

25

26

27

28

1	HOWEVER, nothing in this Stipulation	constitutes an admission that a document, testimony,		
2	or other evidence is admissible. By entering into this Stipulation, the parties are not waiving any			
3	evidentiary objections they may have.			
4		Respectfully submitted,		
5	Dated: April 7, 2010	FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.		
6				
7		By:/s/ Scott R. Mosko		
8		Scott R. Mosko		
9 10		Attorneys for Plaintiff MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC. and Counterclaim Defendants ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC. and ASUS		
11		COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL		
12				
13	Dated: April 7, 2010	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP		
14				
15		By:/s/ Dean G. Dunlavey		
16		Dean G. Dunlavey		
17		Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.		
18				
19				
20	Dated: April 7, 2010	HOWREY LLP		
21				
22		By: /s/ Duane Mathiowetz Duane Mathiowetz		
23		Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant		
24		O2 MICRO INTERNATIONAL LIMITED		
25	/ / /			
26	/ / /			
27	/ / /			
28				

FILER'S ATTESTATION I, Scott R. Mosko, am the ECF user whose identification and password are being used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Allowing Final Infringement and Invalidity Contentions. Pursuant to General Order No. 45, I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Dean G. Dunlavey and Duane Mathiowetz. Dated: April 7, 2010 /s/ Scott R. Mosko Scott R. Mosko

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

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE (DOCKET #286) IS DENIED AS MOOT.

Dated: 4/13/2010

Claudia Wilken
United States District Judge