

1 DURIE TANGRI LLP  
 2 DARALYN J. DURIE (SBN 169825)  
 3 ddurie@durietangri.com  
 4 DAVID McGOWAN (SBN 154289)  
 5 dmcmgowan@durietangri.com  
 6 EUGENE NOVIKOV (SBN 257849)  
 7 enovikov@durietangri.com  
 8 LAURA E. MILLER (SBN 271713)  
 9 lmiller@durietangri.com  
 10 RAGHAV R. KRISHNAPRIYAN (SBN 273411)  
 11 rkrishnapriyan@durietangri.com  
 12 MATTHEW W. SAMUELS (SBN 294668)  
 13 msamuels@durietangri.com  
 14 217 Leidesdorff Street  
 15 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 16 Telephone: 415-362-6666  
 17 Facsimile: 415-236-6300

10 YOUNG BASILE HANLON & MACFARLANE, P.C.  
 11 JEFFREY D. WILSON (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 12 wilson@youngbasile.com  
 13 ANDREW R. BASILE, JR. (SBN 208396)  
 14 abasile@youngbasile.com  
 15 EDDIE D. WOODWORTH (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 16 woodworth@youngbasile.com  
 17 RYAN T. MCCLEARY (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 18 mccleary@youngbasile.com  
 19 3001 W. Big Beaver Road, Suite 624  
 20 Troy, MI 48084  
 21 Telephone: (248) 649-3333  
 22 Facsimile: (248) 649-3338

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 18 PLEXXIKON INC.

19 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 20 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 21 OAKLAND DIVISION

22 PLEXXIKON INC.,  
 23 Plaintiff,  
 24 v.  
 25 NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS  
 26 CORPORATION,  
 27 Defendant.

Case No. 4:17-cv-04405-HSG

**PLAINTIFF PLEXXIKON INC.'S MOTION  
 AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO  
 SUBMIT OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S  
 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SECOND  
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION**

Ctrm: 2 – 4th Floor  
 Judge: Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2 I. BACKGROUND .....1  
3 II. DISCUSSION .....2  
4 III. CONCLUSION.....3  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*,  
624 F.3d 1253 (9th Cir. 2010) .....2, 3

*Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*,  
116 F.3d 379 (9th Cir. 1997) .....2

*Pincay v. Andrews*,  
389 F.3d 853 (9th Cir. 2004) (en banc) .....3

**Rules**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 6.....1, 2

Local Rule

6-3 .....1

7-2(a).....2

7-3(a).....1

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(B) and Northern District of California Civil  
2 Local Rules 6-3, Plaintiff Plexxikon Inc. (“Plexxikon”) respectfully requests that the Court enter an order  
3 extending the time for Plexxikon to oppose Defendant’s Motion for Leave to File Second Summary  
4 Judgment Motion (“Motion for Leave”) from December 9, 2019 to December 10, 2019 and allowing  
5 Plexxikon’s filing made on that date. Defendant Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation (“Novartis”) has  
6 indicated that it does not consent to Plexxikon’s motion, but does not intend to file an opposition. *See*  
7 Decl. Eugene Novikov in Supp. Mot. (“Novikov Decl.”) ¶ 8, Ex. B.

8 **I. BACKGROUND**

9 Novartis filed its Motion for Leave on November 26, 2019. ECF No. 345. Under Local Rule 7-  
10 3(a), Plexxikon’s opposition to Novartis’s Motion for Leave was due on Monday, December 9, 2019.  
11 *See* L.R. 7-3(a). Plexxikon filed the opposition one day late due to a calendaring error occasioned by an  
12 unfortunate and unlikely series of events.

13 On the evening of the December 3, 2019 Case Management Conference, counsel for Plexxikon  
14 prepared an internal summary of upcoming deadlines incorporating the changed and additional deadlines  
15 announced at the Case Management Conference. *See* Novikov Decl. ¶ 3. In that summary, counsel  
16 inadvertently misstated the deadline for Plexxikon’s opposition to Novartis’s Motion for Leave, writing  
17 that it was due one week from the date of the email’s transmission—i.e., December 10, 2019. *Id.*

18 After the summary was circulated, calendaring staff for Plexxikon’s counsel used the summary to  
19 adjust the case calendar in the firm’s CompuLaw software. *Id.* ¶ 4. Because certain other deadlines and  
20 events were added and changed at the Case Management Conference, as set forth in the summary,  
21 counsel’s calendaring staff interpreted the inadvertent misstatement of the deadline for the opposition to  
22 the Motion for Leave as likewise changing the previously-calendared deadline from December 9 to  
23 December 10, and made the adjustment in the CompuLaw software. *Id.* These changes are reflected in  
24 an Event Audit Report of counsel’s CompuLaw software. *Id.* ¶ 5, Ex. A at 9.

25 Counsel thereafter relied on the incorrectly calendared date to file Plexxikon’s opposition to  
26 Novartis’s Motion for Leave one day late, on December 10, 2019. *Id.* ¶ 6; *see* ECF No. 351. Counsel  
27 discovered the fact of the belated filing after reviewing Novartis’s reply in support of its Motion for  
28 Leave, filed on December 13, 2019. *Id.*; *see* ECF No. 353.

1 **II. DISCUSSION**

2 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(B) provides that for any act that must be done by a party  
3 within a specified time frame, the court may “for good cause, extend the time . . . after the time has  
4 expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B). Courts in the  
5 Ninth Circuit examine factors such as the danger of prejudice to the nonmoving party, the length of the  
6 delay and its potential impact on judicial proceedings, the reason for the delay, and whether the movant  
7 acted in good faith. *Briones v. Riviera Hotel & Casino*, 116 F.3d 379, 381 (9th Cir. 1997). “[T]he  
8 determination of whether a party’s neglect is excusable ‘is at bottom an equitable one, taking account of  
9 all relevant circumstances surrounding the party’s omission.’” *Id.* at 382 (quoting *Pioneer Inv. Servs.*  
10 *Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P’ship*, 507 U.S. 380, 395 (1993)). “This rule, like all the Federal Rules of  
11 Civil Procedure, ‘[is] to be liberally construed to effectuate the general purpose of seeing that cases are  
12 tried on the merits.’” *Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc.*, 624 F.3d 1253, 1258–59 (9th Cir. 2010)  
13 (alteration in original) (citations omitted).

14 Counsel’s failure to timely file Plexxikon’s opposition to Novartis’s Motion for Leave is the  
15 result of excusable neglect. As to the first *Briones* factor, prejudice, Novartis does not contend in its  
16 reply brief that it would be prejudiced should the Court accept Plexxikon’s opposition. *See* ECF No. 353  
17 at 1. As to the second, the length of the delay and its impact, Plexxikon’s one-day delay will not impact  
18 the proceedings in this case, as Novartis’s motion remains scheduled to be heard on January 19, 2019,  
19 and the motion is now completely briefed with a longer lead time to the hearing than the Local Rules  
20 specify. *See* L.R. 7-2(a). Moreover, the Ninth Circuit has found longer delays sufficiently *de minimis* to  
21 warrant permitting the late filing. *See, e.g., Ahanchian*, 624 F.3d at 1262 (concluding plaintiff’s counsel  
22 sufficiently established that his three-day-late filing of an opposition to defendant’s summary judgment  
23 motion was the result of excusable neglect); *Briones*, 116 F.3d at 380 (remanding for district court to  
24 consider whether to entertain opposition filed three and one-half months after the filing deadline).

25 The third and fourth factors, the reason for the delay and the movant’s good faith, also weigh in  
26 favor of granting Plexxikon’s motion here. As explained above and in the accompanying declaration, the  
27 delay was due to an unlikely confluence of events that caused counsel’s calendared deadline to  
28 incorrectly shift by a day. The Ninth Circuit has found excusable neglect on a less clear record. *See*



**ORDER**

Having considered Plaintiff Plexxikon Inc.'s Motion to Extend Time to Oppose Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Second Summary Judgment Motion and the materials submitted in connection therewith, the Court hereby GRANTS Plexxikon's motion. The Court finds the December 10, 2019 filing of Plexxikon's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Second Summary Judgment Motion, ECF No. 351, to be the result of excusable neglect, and allows this filing under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(B) and Northern District of California Civil Local Rules 6-3.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date:12/17/2019

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.  
United States District Judge