

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
28E-FILED on 3/1/10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BEL FUSE INC., ELEC & ELTEK (USA)
CORPORATION, WURTH ELECTRONICS
MIDCOM., INC., XFMRS, INC.

Defendants.

No. C-07-06222 RMW

ORDER DECLINING TELEPHONIC
CONFERENCE AND DECLINING TO
POSTPONE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND
RELATED DATES


[Re Docket No. 150]

The court has received correspondence written on behalf of all defendants in this action and has also received plaintiff Halo Electronics, Inc. ("Halo")'s response. Defendants seek to postpone all dates related to claim construction in this action, pending a claim construction order in another litigation pending in Nevada. Halo objects to such postponement, pointing out that this case is already more than two years old and that the litigation in Nevada is between Halo and an unrelated defendant. Moreover, any claim construction order in the Nevada case would not have preclusive effect in this case, absent a final judgment. The court therefore declines to postpone claim construction and related deadlines in this action. Accordingly, a telephonic conference discussing adjournment of dates relating to claim construction is not necessary.

1 The court notes that the letter from defendants states that Halo is asserting approximately
2 119 claims in this action. Although Halo has indicated that it is working to streamline the number of
3 asserted claims and believes its revised list will be less than 30 claims, even 30 claims seems
4 excessive to the court. Patent Local Rule 4-3(c) requires the parties to identify "the terms whose
5 construction will be most significant to the resolution of the case up to a maximum of 10." If the
6 number of asserted claims and disputed terms is not substantially narrowed by the Claim
7 Construction Prehearing Conference set for May 7, 2010, this will be the first issue to be addressed
8 by the court.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: 3/1/10



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

1 **Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

2 **Counsel for Plaintiff:**

3	Juanita R. Brooks	brooks@fr.com
	Limin Zheng	zheng@fr.com
4	John Cameron Adkisson	jca@fr.com
	Michael J Kane	kane@fr.com
5	Michael J. Pape	pape@fr.com
	Sarah Bray	bray@fr.com
6	William R. Woodford	woodford@fr.com

7 **Counsel for Defendants:**

8	Joshua L. Raskin	JRaskin@wolfblock.com
	Andrew P. Nemiroff	anemiroff@cozen.com
9	Martin C. Fliesler	mcf@fdml.com
	Martin G. Raskin	mraskin@cozen.com
10	Rex Hwang	rhwang@fdml.com
	Kent Andrew Lambert	klambert@bakerdonelson.com
11	Michael Joseph Powell	mpowell@bakerdonelson.com
	Samuel F Miller	smiller@bakerdonelson.com
12	Sarah Katherine Casey	skcasey@bakerdonelson.com
	Terry John Mollica	tjm@cmlawoffices.com
13	A. Neal Seth	nseth@bakerlaw.com
	Emily Rita Frank	efrank@bakerlaw.com
14	Harold C. Moore	hcmoore@maginot.com
	Christopher Todd Norris	todd.norris@bullivant.com
15	David Moorman	drmoorman@maginot.com

16
17 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

18
19
20 **Dated:** 3/1/10

CCL
Chambers of Judge Whyte

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28