

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

MELLANOX TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.,
Plaintiff,
v.
METHODE ELECTRONICS, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-3730-PJH

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART MOTION TO
DISMISS**

Defendant's motion to dismiss came on for hearing before this court on March 2, 2016. Plaintiff Mellanox Technologies, Ltd. ("plaintiff") appeared through its counsel, Xavier Brandwajn. Defendant Methode Electronics, Inc. ("defendant") appeared through its counsel, David Newman. Having read the papers filed in conjunction with the motion and carefully considered the arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the court hereby GRANTS in part and DENIES in part defendant's motion, with leave to amend, as stated at the hearing.

The motion is DENIED to the extent that it seeks dismissal of plaintiff's direct infringement allegations, but GRANTED with leave to amend to the extent that it seeks dismissal of plaintiff's indirect infringement allegations. Any amended complaint must specifically allege facts regarding each element of induced infringement and contributory infringement. Plaintiff shall have until **March 23, 2016** to file a second amended complaint in accordance with this order. Defendant shall have 21 days thereafter to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 4, 2016



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge