

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5

6 ADAPTIX, INC.,

7 Plaintiff,

No. C 13-1774 PJH

8 v.

9 **NOTICE OF PENDING MOTION TO**
10 **RELATE CASES**

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, et al.,

11 Defendants.
12 _____/

13 Before the court is a motion to relate the following six cases:

- 14 1. No. 13-1774,
- Adaptix v. Motorola Mobility LLC, et al.
-
- 15 2. No. 13-1776,
- Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.
-
- 16 3. No. 13-1777,
- Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.
-
- 17 4. No. 13-1778,
- Adaptix v. AT&T Mobility LLC, et al.
-
- 18 5. No. 13-1844,
- Adaptix v. Cellco Partnership, et al.
-
- 19 6. No. 13-2023,
- Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.

20 The motion was filed by defendant Motorola Mobility LLC in this case, and a
21 statement of non-opposition was filed by plaintiff Adaptix. The other defendant in this case,
22 Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless) filed a statement in support of Motorola's
23 motion. However, no other parties have filed a response - either to support relation or to
24 object to it. It appears that no notice of Motorola's motion was given to the parties in the
25 other cases, so the court provides such notice with this order.26 The court also notes that all parties in case no. 13-1844 have consented to proceed
27 before Magistrate Judge Grewal. While some defendants in the other Adaptix cases have
28 filed declinations to proceed before another magistrate judge, they have not indicated
whether they would similarly decline to proceed before Magistrate Judge Grewal.

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

Thus, each party is directed to file a statement, no later than **May 28, 2013**,
addressing these two issues:

- (1) whether the party supports or opposes Motorola's motion to relate all six cases;
- (2) whether the party would consent to proceed before Magistrate Judge Grewal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 20, 2013



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge