CONFERENCE AND TRIAL

[all counsel listed on signature page] 1 2 DENIED WITHO 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES GENERAL IP Case No. 5:04-cv-05385-JW 12 PTE LTD. and AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES ORDER DENYING STIPULATION FOR ECBU IP PTE LTD., organized and 13 ORDER CONTINUING PRETRIAL incorporated under the laws of Singapore, **CONFERENCE** 14 Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants, 15 Date: March 23, 2009 VS. Time: 3:00 p.m. 16 Judge: James Ware ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORP., a Courtroom: Taiwanese corporation, and ELAN 17 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP, a 18 California Corporation, 19 Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiff. 20 21 Plaintiffs Avago Technologies General IP PTE LTD and Avago Technologies ECBU IP 22 PTE LTD ("Avago") and Defendant Elan Microelectronics Corporation ("Elan"), through their 23 undersigned counsel, stipulate as follows and jointly respectfully request an Order rescheduling the Joint 24 Pretrial Conference Statement, the Pretrial Conference, and trial. 25 1. The parties have re-opened settlement negotiations and are planning a meeting in 26 California in early March. 27 2. The parties wish to minimize litigation expenses pending the March meeting and to avoid 28 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 1 5:04-cy-05385-JW ORDER RESCHEDULING PRETRIAL

1		burdening the Court in the event that the parties are successful in reaching settlement
2		terms.
3	3.	Under the current schedule, the Joint Pretrial Conference Statement and accompanying
4		Motion in Limine, exhibits lists, witness lists and related exhibits are due February 23,
5		2009. The Pretrial Conference is scheduled for March 23, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. Jury
6		Selection is currently set for April 14 and trial is set to commence April 15, 2009.
7	4.	The parties jointly request that the Court reschedule the Pretrial Conference and trial and
8		vacate the February 23, 2009 Joint Pretrial Conference Statement deadline so that the
9		parties can devote their efforts to settlement efforts rather than trial preparation.
10	Dated: Febru	ary 17, 2009 Respectfully submitted,
		Richard E. Lyon (SBN 229288)
12		IRELL & MANELLA LLP 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
13 14		Los Angeles, California 90067-4276 Telephone: (310) 277-1010 r-lyon@irell.com
15		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16		Avago Technologies General IP PTR Ltd. and Avago Technologies ECBU IP PTE Ltd.
17		By: <u>/s/ Richard E. Lyon</u> Richard E. Lyon
18		
19		Elizabeth H. Rader (SBN 184963) ALSTON & BIRD LLP
20		Two Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 400
21		Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112 Telephone: (650) 838-2000
22		elizabeth.rader@alston.com
23 24		Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiff ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORP. and ELAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP
25		ELMINIM ORGANITION TECHNOLOGI GROOT
26		By:/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader
27		Elizabeth H. Rader
28		
-0		

1			
2	FILER'S ATTESTATION		
3	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X (B) regarding signatures, I, Elizabeth H. Rader,		
4	attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.		
5	<u>/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader</u>		
	Elizabeth H. Rader		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
12	I certify that all counsel of record, who are deemed to have consented to electronic service, are being served on February 17, 2009, with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system.		
13			
14			
15	Morgan Chu, Esq. mchu@irell.com		
16	Alan J. Heinrich, Esq. aheinrich@irell.com		
17	David C. McPhie, Esq. dmcphie@irell.com		
18	Richard E. Lyon, III, Esq. rlyon@irell.com		
19			
20	Samuel Kai Lu, Esq. slu@irell.com		
21	By: <u>/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader</u> Elizabeth H. Rader		
22			
23	Attorney for Defendants ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORP. and		
24	ELAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP		
25			
26			
27			

28

CROP MERCORDER

Although the Court is encouraged that the parties have re-opened settlement negotiations, the Court finds that, in light of the age of the case and the parties' previous efforts at settlement, vacating the pretrial deadlines would only create a further delay in resolving this 2004 case. Accordingly, the Court DENIES the parties' Stipulation without prejudice to be renewed. Nothing in this Order prevents the parties from completing the pretrial processes and simultaneously discuss settlement. In the event that the parties' settlement discussions are fruitful and definite, the parties may renew their request.

12 Dated: February 19, 2009

AMES WARE

United States District Judge