17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

** E-filed January 20, 2010 ** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NOT FOR CITATION 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 THE APPLE IPOD ITUNES ANTITRUST No. C05-00037 JW (HRL) LITIGATION 12 ORDER GRANTING APPLE INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO 13 CONTINUE THE HEARING ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL 14 [Re: Docket No. 310] 15 16 Defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") moves to continue the hearing date for plaintiffs' motion to

Defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") moves to continue the hearing date for plaintiffs' motion to compel, currently set for February 16, 2010. Apple argues that a continuance is appropriate because the discovery at issue is based on plaintiffs' original complaint—but that Judge Ware has since ordered plaintiffs to file an amended complaint by January 25, 2010 in light of that court's earlier dismissal of plaintiffs' tying claims. (*See* Docket No. 303.) Apple notes that a case management conference is set for February 22, 2010 that will include a discussion of any further discovery and dispositive motions, and that it intends to request a stay of discovery at that time. It says that as a result, it would be inefficient to hold the hearing on plaintiffs' motion prior to February 22.

Plaintiffs oppose the motion, arguing that their claims have not been dismissed and that they plan to file an amended consolidated complaint that will not change the substance of their allegations in this case. They assert that the discovery at issue, served nine months ago, will still be relevant to their monopoly claims in its forthcoming amended complaint, and thus, that they will be prejudiced by a continuance or stay of discovery.

In light of the fact that plaintiffs have not yet filed an amended complaint pursuant to Judge Ware's December 21, 2009 order and the fact that the motion to compel, filed after Judge Ware's order, is currently scheduled just in advance of the February 22 case management conference, the court finds good cause to grant a short continuance. Of course, the parties must present any arguments they may have concerning an overall stay of discovery to Judge Ware. Accordingly, the hearing on plaintiffs' motion to compel is continued to March 23, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. Apple's opposition or statement of non-opposition is due March 2, 2010. Plaintiffs' reply, if any, is due March 9, 2010.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 20, 2010

HO VARD R. LOYD UNIVED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

C 05-00037 JW (HRL) Notice will be electronically mailed to:

2	Adam Richard Sand, Esq	invalidaddress@invalidaddress.com
	Alreen Haeggquist	alreenh@zhlaw.com, judyj@zhlaw.com
3	Andrew S. Friedman	afriedman@bffb.com, rcreech@bffb.com
	Bonny E. Sweeney	bonnys@csgrr.com, christinas@csgrr.com, E_file_sd@csgrr.com
4	J	proach@csgrr.com
-	Brian P Murray	bmurray@murrayfrank.com
5	Caroline Nason Mitchell	cnmitchell@jonesday.com, ewallace@jonesday.com,
		mlandsborough@jonesday.com
6	Craig Ellsworth Stewart	cestewart@jonesday.com, mlandsborough@jonesday.com
_	David Craig Kiernan	dkiernan@jonesday.com, lwong@jonesday.com,
7		valdajani@jonesday.com
-	Elaine A. Ryan	eryan@bffb.com, pjohnson@bffb.com
8	Francis Joseph Balint, Jr	fbalint@bffb.com
Ŭ	Helen I. Zeldes	helenz@zhlaw.com
9	Jacqueline Sailer	jsailer@murrayfrank.com
	John J. Stoia, Jr	jstoia@csgrr.com
10	Michael D. Braun	service@braunlawgroup.com, clc@braunlawgroup.com
	Michael Tedder Scott	michaelscott@jonesday.com, gwayte@jonesday.com
11	Paula Michelle Roach	proach@csgrr.com
	Robert Allan Mittelstaedt	ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com, ybennett@jonesday.com
12	Roy A. Katriel	rak@katriellaw.com, rk618@aol.com
	Thomas J. Kennedy	tkennedy@murrayfrank.com
13	Thomas Robert Merrick	tmerrick@csgrr.com
	Todd David Carpenter	tcarpenter@bffb.com
14		1
=		

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California