

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

CENTRIFY CORPORATION,

No. C 10-3873 CW (MEJ)

Plaintiff,

**DISCOVERY ORDER RE:
CUSTOMER INFORMATION**

v.

QUEST SOFTWARE, INC.,

Defendant.

_____ /

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint discovery dispute letter regarding Centrify's request to compel Quest to identify customers who use technology that, according to Centrify, infringes the '005 patent at issue. Dkt. No. 98. In the letter, the parties refer to Quest's Motion to Enforce Court Orders and Strike Centrify's Amended Infringement Contentions. Dkt. No. 90. Quest maintains that the Court should not determine the present dispute until after it resolves Quest's motion to strike. However, on October 5, 2011, the Court denied Quest's motion without prejudice and ordered the parties to comply with the undersigned's discovery standing order. As the parties have not met and conferred and filed a joint letter regarding Quest's motion to strike, it is not presently before the Court. Therefore, the Court finds it prudent to defer any ruling on the present discovery dispute until after the motion to strike has been resolved..

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 24, 2011



Maria-Elena James
Chief United States Magistrate Judge