

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

SYNCHRONOSS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
DROPBOX INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-00119-HSG](#)


**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION TO CHANGE THE
COORDINATED CASE SCHEDULE**

Re: Dkt. No. 136

Pending before the Court is Defendant Dropbox, Inc.’s motion to change the coordinated case schedule. Dkt. No. 136 (“Mot.”). Plaintiff Synchronoss Technologies, Inc. (“Synchronoss”) has filed its opposition. Dkt. No. 138. Dropbox requests that the Court enter a revised schedule for the Markman process to provide time for Synchronoss to supplement its infringement contentions by September 8, 2017. Mot. at 5. Dropbox argues that “[c]ourts in this district regularly delay claim construction deadlines where a plaintiff has failed to timely provide non-deficient infringement contentions.” Id. at 4. There has been no such showing here, nor has Dropbox even raised this issue before the assigned discovery magistrate judge. No good cause having been shown to change the coordinated case schedule, Dropbox’s motion is **DENIED**.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/15/2017


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge

¹ The Court finds this matter appropriate for disposition without oral argument and the matter is deemed submitted. See Civil L.R. 7-1(b).