

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7 OAKLAND DIVISION

8 **CELLSPIN SOFT, INC.**

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 **FITBIT, INC.**

12 Defendant.

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Case No. 17-cv-05928-YGR

13 v.

14 **MOOV, INC.**

15 Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-05929-YGR

16 v.

17 **NIKE, INC.,**

18 Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-05931-YGR

19 v.

20 **FOSSIL GROUP, INC. ET AL**

21 Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-05933-YGR

22 v.

23 **GARMIN INTERNATIONAL INC. ET AL**

24 Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-05934-YGR

25 v.

26 **CANNON U.S.A., INC.**

27 Defendant

Case No. 17-cv-05938-YGR

1 v. 2 <b>GoPro, Inc.</b> 3 Defendant.	Case No. 17-cv-05939-YGR
4 v. 5 <b>PANASONIC CORPORATION OF NORTH AMERICA</b> 6 Defendant.	Case No. 17-cv-05941-YGR
7 v. 8 <b>JK IMAGING, LTD.</b> 9 Defendant.	Case No. 17-cv-06881-YGR

11 The Court is in receipt of plaintiff’s response to defendants’ supplemental brief in support of motion  
 12 to dismiss. (Dkt, No. 73.)<sup>1</sup> By way of background, on December 22, 2017, this Court set a briefing  
 13 schedule for defendants’ motion to dismiss with a hearing date of March 6, 2018. (Dkt No. 23.) On March  
 14 2, 2017, plaintiff filed amended complaints in the above-captioned matters. At the hearing held on March 6,  
 15 2018, defense counsel asked the Court whether the Court required “additional papers addressing” the  
 16 amended complaints. (Dkt. No. 68 at 51:23–24.) The Court responded that a supplemental brief “would be  
 17 helpful to close the loop” and ordered counsel to file said brief by Monday, March 12, 2018. (*Id.* at 51:25–  
 18 52:1.) Defendants filed an omnibus supplemental brief on March 12, 2018. (Dkt. No. 64.)

19 On March 20, 2018, plaintiff filed a response to defendants’ supplemental brief without seeking prior  
 20 Court approval. (Dkt. No. 73.) Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3(d), “[o]nce a reply is filed, no additional  
 21 memoranda, papers or letters may be filed without prior Court approval, except” for objections to reply  
 22 evidence or to “[b]efore the hearing date . . . [to] bring o the Court’s attention a relevant judicial opinion  
 23 published after the date the opposition or reply was filed.” Here, counsel failed to seek “prior Court  
 24 approval” before filing the supplemental brief.

---

27 <sup>1</sup> All citations to docket entries refer to *Cellspin Soft Inc. v. Fitbit, Inc.*, 17-cv-05928-YGR.

1           Accordingly, plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** as to why plaintiff's response to  
2 defendants' supplemental brief should not be stricken or plaintiff should not be sanctioned \$250 for failure  
3 to follow Court rules by **Monday, March 26, 2018**. The hearing on the order to show cause will be held on  
4 **Monday, April 2, 2018 at 3:01 p.m.** If the Court is satisfied with plaintiff's response to the order to show  
5 cause or if plaintiff pays the sanctions, the hearing will be taken off calendar.

6           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: March 22, 2018

8   
9 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**  
United States District Court Judge