

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

VIGILOS, LLC,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
FORA CARE, INC.,  
Defendant.

No. C 11-06240 WHA  
No. C 11-04117 SBA


**ORDER REGARDING  
FEBRUARY 3 SUBMISSION**

Only plaintiff Vigilos, LLC responded to the January 31 order requesting additional information regarding the motion to relate. Plaintiff’s response was inadequate. By **NOON ON FEBRUARY 8**, plaintiff shall please submit a more detailed disclosure stating *exactly* which patent claims are being asserted against *each* defendant and whether there are discrepancies. Plaintiff shall also submit a more detailed description of the allegedly infringing products and defendants’ relationship with each other regarding the products.

The January 31 order requested “the parties” to explain the nature of the allegedly infringing products. Defendants in both the *Sling Media* action (Case No. 4:11-cv-04117-SBA) and the above-captioned action failed to respond to the January 31 order. By **NOON ON FEBRUARY 8**, defendants shall submit a description of the allegedly infringing products and defendants’ relationship with each other regarding the products.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 6, 2012.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California