

1 Juanita Brooks (CA#75934 / brooks@fr.com)
 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 2 12390 El Camino Real
 San Diego, CA 92130
 3 Telephone: (858) 678-5070
 Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

4 Limin Zheng (CA #226875 / zheng@fr.com)
 5 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
 6 Redwood City, CA 94063
 Telephone: (650) 839-5070
 7 Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

E-FILED - 5/6/10

8 Michael J. Kane (Admitted *pro hac vice* / kane@fr.com)
 William R. Woodford (Admitted *pro hac vice* / woodford@fr.com)
 9 Michael J. Pape (Admitted *pro hac vice* / pape@fr.com)
 John C. Adkisson (Admitted *pro hac vice* / adkisson@fr.com)
 10 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
 3200 RBC Plaza
 11 60 South Sixth Street
 Minneapolis, MN 55402
 12 Telephone: (612) 335-5070
 Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 14 HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 (SAN JOSE DIVISION)

18 HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 BEL FUSE INC., E & E MAGNETIC
 22 PRODUCTS LIMITED, ELEC & ELTEK (USA)
 CORPORATION, WURTH ELECTRONICS
 23 MIDCOM, INC., WURTH ELEKTRONIK
 GMBH & CO. KG, and XFMRS, INC.,

24 Defendants

Civil Case No. 07-6222 RMW

**STIPULATION AND []
 ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR HALO
 ELECTRONICS, INC. TO RESPOND TO
 ELEC & ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION
 AND WURTH ELECTRONICS MIDCOM,
 INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM
 TO HALO'S FIRST AMENDED
 COMPLAINT (DOC. NOS. 168, 170)**

25
 26
 27
 28 STIPULATION AND [ORDER EXTENDING TIME FOR
 HALO ELECTRONICS, INC. TO RESPOND TO ELEC & ELTEK (USA)
 CORPORATION AND WURTH ELECTRONICS MIDCOM, INC.'S
 ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM TO HALO'S FIRST AMENDED
 COMPLAINT (DOC. NOS. 168, 170)
 Case No. 07-6222 RMW

1 On April 21, 2010, the Court granted Plaintiff Halo Electronics, Inc. (“Halo”) and
2 Defendants Elec & Eltek (USA) Corporation (“E&E (USA)”) and Wurth Electronics Midcom, Inc.
3 (“Midcom”)’s stipulation and request to extend the time for Halo to respond to E&E (USA) and
4 Midcom’s respective Answers and Counterclaims to Halo’s First Amended Complaint (Doc. Nos.
5 168 and 170, respectively) from April 19, 2010 until, and including May 3, 2010, to provide the
6 parties an opportunity to meet and confer on Halo’s motion to strike the inequitable conduct
7 allegations in E&E (USA) and Midcom’s Answers, which Halo currently intends to file with its
8 Answers to E&E (USA) and Midcom’s Counterclaims. (Doc. No. 179)

9 The parties met and conferred telephonically on April 23, 2010. Following the meet and
10 confer, counsel for E&E (USA) advised that although E&E (USA) disagrees that the affirmative
11 defenses were deficient, it was willing to amend, and would be able to send counsel for Halo a
12 proposed amended answer by May 11, 2010.

13 To allow the parties sufficient time to further meet and confer, Halo, E&E (USA), and
14 Midcom, by and through their counsel, hereby stipulate and respectfully propose the following:

- 15 1. E&E (USA) and Midcom shall provide to Halo a copy of proposed Amended
16 Answers no later than May 11, 2010;
- 17 2. The parties shall meet and confer regarding E&E (USA) and Midcom’s proposed
18 amendment no later than May 13, 2010;
- 19 3. E&E (USA) and Midcom shall advise Halo of their decision as to whether they will
20 amend their Answers no later than May 14, 2010;
- 21 4. If E&E (USA) and Midcom intend to amend their Answers, they shall do so no
22 later than May 17, 2010;
- 23 5. Otherwise, Halo shall file its response to E&E (USA) and Midcom’s respective
24 Answers and Counterclaims to Halo’s First Amended Complaint (Doc. Nos. 168
25 and 170) no later than May 17, 2010.

1 The parties do not believe that the proposed extension of time will alter the date of any
2 event or deadline already fixed by Court Order.

3 Respectfully submitted,

4
5 Dated: May 3, 2010

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

6
7 By: /s/ Michael J. Kane
8 Michael J. Kane

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff
10 HALO ELECTRONICS, INC.

11 Dated: May 3, 2010

BAKER DONELSON BEARMAN CALDWELL
& BERKOWITZ, P.C.

12
13 By: /s/ Michael J. Powell
14 Michael J. Powell

15 Attorneys for Defendant
16 ELEC & ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION

17
18 Dated: May 3, 2010

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

19
20
21 By: /s/ Neal Seth
Neal Seth

22 Attorneys for Defendant
23 WURTH ELECTRONICS MIDCOM, INC.

1 IT IS SO ORDERED.

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

Dated: 5/6/10

Ronald M. Whyte

HONORABLE RONALD M. WHITE
United States District Judge

³STIPULATION AND ORDER EXTENDING TIME
FOR HALO ELECTRONICS, INC. TO RESPOND TO ELEC &
ELTEK (USA) CORPORATION AND WURTH ELECTRONICS
MIDCOM, INC.'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIM TO HALO'S
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (DOC. NOS. 168, 170)
Case No. 07-6222 RMW

1 Pursuant to the Northern District of California Electronic Filing Procedures and General
2 Order No. 45, I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the
3 signatories listed above.

4
5 Dated: May 3, 2010

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

6 By: /s/ Limin Zheng
7 Limin Zheng
8 Attorney for Plaintiff
9 HALO, INC.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26