Halo Electronics, Inc. v. Bel Fuse Inc. et al

Dockets.Justia.com

Doc. 370

On March 24, 2011, the Court issued an Order setting the post-Markman case schedule. (Dkt. 360). Following further meet and confer, the parties have agreed to, and hereby propose, the following revised discovery deadlines. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, the parties respectfully request that the Court issue an Order resetting certain deadlines in the case schedule as set forth below. The proposed changes do not affect any hearing or proceeding on the Court's calendar.

EVENT	RELEVANT LOCAL RULE <sup>1</sup> OR COURT'S STANDING ORDER	CURRENTLY SCHEDULE DATES	REVISED DATES
Non-Deposition Fact Discovery Cut-Off		May 10, 2011	May 10, 2011
Fact Deposition Cut-Off (except for the deposition of T.K. Luk) <sup>2</sup>		May 10, 2011 <sup>3</sup>	June 17, 2011
Final Date for Motions to Compel Fact Discovery (including both non-deposition and deposition discovery)	No more than 7 days after cut-off (Civ. L.R. 37-3)	May 17, 2011	July 7, 2011
Deadline for Expert Reports for Issues on which the Parties Bear the Burden		June 10, 2011	July 8, 2011
Deadline for Rebuttal Expert Reports		July 1, 2011	July 29, 2011

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The applicable Patent Local Rules are the Patent Local Rules instituted on January 1, 2001, because this case was filed prior to March 1, 2008.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> To the extent Mr. T.K. Luk will testify at the trial, he may be deposed in the United States by Plaintiff at least one week before the trial,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The March 24, 2011 Order did not distinguish non-deposition and deposition fact discovery.

1 2	Expert Discovery Cut-Off		July 26, 2011	August 17, 2011		
3	Final Date for	No later than 7 days after cut-off	August 2, 2011	August 26, 2011		
4	Motions to Compel Expert Discovery	(Civ. L.R. 37-3)				
5						
6	The Proposed Revised Dates do not affect any other dates, including the Trial Date, set in					
7	the March 24, 2011 Order.					
8						
9						
10	Respectfully submitted,					
11	Doted: April 27, 2011 MACINOT MOODE & DECK LLD					
12	Dated:April 27, 2011_		MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP			
13		ŀ	By: <u>/s/Harold C. Moore</u> Harold C. Moore			
14			Attorneys for Defendar XMFRS, INC.	nt		
15 16						
17	Dated: April 27, 2	2011 F	FISH & RICHARDSON P	C.		
18	<u> </u>					
19			By:/s/Limin Zheng Limin Zheng			
20			Attorneys for Plaintiff HALO, INC.			
21						
22	Dated: April 27,	2011	COZEN O'CONNOR			
23		E	By: /s/Andrew P. Nemin Andrew P. Nemiroff	<u>roff</u>		
24			Attorneys for Defendar BEL FUSE, INC.	ıt		
25			BEL FUSE, INC.			
26						
27						

28

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				
3	counsel for the parties, the signatories listed above.				
4	Dated: <u>April 27, 2011</u>	MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP			
5		By: /s/Harold C. Moore			
6		Harold C. Moore			
7		Attorney for Defendant XFMRS, INC.			
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>					
۷۵ ا	1	3			

## [] ORDER Good cause having been shown, the Court grants the parties' administrative request and adopts the Proposed Revised Dates proposed by the Parties as revisions to the case schedule. IT IS SO ORDERED. Ronald M. Whyte HONORABLE RONALD M. WHYTE Dated: \_\_\_5/17/11 United States District Judge