

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CYNTec COMPANY, LTD.,
Plaintiff,
v.
CHILISIN ELECTRONICS CORP., et
al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-00939-PJH

**ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-
REPLY**

Re: Dkt. No. 308

Before the court is defendant Chilisin’s administrative motion for leave to file a sur-reply to plaintiff Cyntec’s motion for permanent injunction. See Dkt. 308. Chilisin argues that Cyntec raised a new argument in its reply brief, and argues that a sur-reply “is an appropriate way for Chilisin to address Cyntec’s new argument.” Id. at 1.

Cyntec opposes the motion. See Dkt. 309. Cyntec argues that it was Chilisin that raised the new argument in its opposition brief, and argues that “Cyntec’s response thereto cannot justify the filing of a sur-reply by Chilisin.” Id. at 1.

The court concludes that Cyntec’s reply brief did not raise a new argument, and instead simply responded to an argument raised in Chilisin’s opposition brief. Accordingly, Chilisin’s administrative motion for leave to file a sur-reply is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 21, 2022

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge