\*\*E-Filed 1/5/2011\*\* **AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER** SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 1 & FELD LLP ROBERT B. MORRILL (SBN 035488) REGINALD D. STEER (SBN 056342) rmorrill@sidley.com 2 PETER H. KANG (SBN 158101) rsteer@akingump.com AMIT KURLEKAR (SBN 244230) pkang@sidley.com 3 akurlekar@akingump.com AARON R. BLEHARSKI (SBN 240703) ableharski@sidley.com 580 California Street. 15th Floor 4 San Francisco, CA 94104-1036 1001 Page Mill Road, Building 1 (415) 765-9500 Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: 5 Facsimile: (415) 765-9501 Telephone: (650) 565-7000 Facsimile: (650) 565-7100 6 FRED I. WILLIAMS (Pro Hac Vice) fwilliams@akingump.com PHILIP. W. WOO (SBN 196459) 7 300 West Sixth Street, Suite 2100 pwoo@sidley.com 555 California Street, Suite 2000 8 Austin, TX 78701 Telephone: (512) 499-6200 San Francisco, CA 94104 9 Facsimile: (512) 499-6290 Telephone: (415) 772-1200 Facsimile: (415) 772-7400 ERIC J. KLEIN (Pro Hac Vice) 10 eklein@akingump.com Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimants 1700 Pacific Ave., 41st Floor SHUTTLE, INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER 11 Dallas, TX 75201 GROUP, INC. Telephone: (214) 969-2751 12 Facsimile: (214) 969-4343 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff LENOVO (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD. 14 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 SAN JOSE DIVISION 18 19 Case No. 5:08-CV-3454-JF-PSG LENOVO (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD., 20 Plaintiff, 21 JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] VS. ORDER REGARDING STAY PENDING 22 SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS SHUTTLE, INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP, INC., 23 Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel Defendants. 24 25 26 27 28

Plaintiff Lenovo (Singapore) Pte. Ltd. ("Plaintiff") and Defendants Shuttle Inc. and Shuttle Computer Group Inc. (together "Defendants") respectfully request that the Court enter an order staying this case until February 24, 2011 pending the outcome of settlement discussions. In support of this Stipulation, the parties state as follows:

### I. Reasons for Requested Stay

- 1. On or about November 22, 2010, representatives for both parties met in Taiwan to discuss a possible settlement of the pending litigation. During those discussions, the parties reached a preliminary agreement to a four week standstill in the lawsuit while settlement discussions continue. At that time, the parties also agreed and requested that the Court stay all case deadlines, both Court imposed and discovery related, during this four week period. In the event that a settlement could not be reached, the parties requested that the Court extend the case deadlines set forth in the Joint Stipulated Case Management Order entered by the Court on September 2, 2010 by four weeks. The Court signed an Order granting the stay on November 30, 2010.
- 2. However, due to the holiday season, the parties were unable to complete settlement discussions during the four week period. Moreover, given the holiday season, the four week adjustment of the case schedule did not provide ample time to satisfy approaching deadlines. For example, pursuant to the Court's November 30, 2010 Order, the deadline for claim construction discovery was shifted from December 23, 2010 to January 20, 2011. Even under the adjusted timeline, the parties' ability to conduct claim construction discovery would be hindered given the logistics of scheduling and conducting depositions over the holidays, in addition to the parties' continuing efforts to collect responsive documents. Therefore, on December 21, 2010 the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Modify Case Management Order Pursuant to L.R. 6-2 requesting an additional four week extension of all remaining deadlines established by September 2, 2010 Order and modified by the November 30, 2010 Order.
- 3. Since requesting an extension on December 21, 2010, the parties have reached an agreement regarding a standstill in the lawsuit through February 24, 2011 while settlement discussions continue. The parties have agreed and request that the Court stay all case deadlines, both Court imposed and discovery related, until February 24, 2011. The parties request the standstill

through February 24, 2011 in order to accommodate the upcoming holidays, including the Chinese New Year. The Chinese New Year falls on February 2, 2011, and it is customary for people to take the week off before and/or after for family gathering. Thus, Defendants may not be able to communicate in a most timely fashion from now to shortly after the Chinese New Year. In the event that the parties cannot reach a settlement, the parties request that the Court extend the current case deadlines set forth in the Joint Stipulated Case Management Order entered by the Court on September 2, 2010 and modified by the Court's November 30, 2010 Order as set forth in section III below.

#### **II.** Previous Time Modifications

- 4. On July 17, 2008, Plaintiff filed the Complaint (*see* Dkt. No. 1). On the same day, the Court set a Case Management Conference ("CMC") for Oct. 27, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 3).
- 5. On Aug. 18. 2008, this case was reassigned to Judge Fogel (*see* Dkt. No. 11). The CMC scheduled for Oct. 27, 2008 was vacated.
- 6. On Sept. 26, 2008, the parties filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order enlarging Defendants' time to reply to Plaintiff's Complaint to Dec. 1, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 17). Judge Fogel granted this request on Oct. 6, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 20).
- 7. On Sep. 30, 2008, before the extension was granted by Judge Fogel, the Court noticed the CMC for Oct. 31, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 19).
- 8. On Oct. 21, 2008, the parties field a Stipulation and Proposed Order to Extend CMC and ADR Deadlines (*see* Dkt. No. 22). Judge Fogel granted this request on Oct. 22, 2008, setting the CMC for Dec. 5, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 23).
- 9. On Nov. 14, 2008, the parties filed a Second Stipulation and Proposed Order to Extend the CMC and ADR Deadlines (*see* Dkt. No. 28). Judge Fogel granted this request on Nov. 17, 2008, setting the CMC for Dec. 19, 2008 (*see* Dkt. No. 30).
- 10. On Dec. 19, 2008, the Court set a further CMC for Mar. 20, 2009 (*see* Dkt. No. 38). On Mar. 13, 2009, the Court continued the CMC to Mar. 23, 2009 (*see* Dkt. No. 41).
- 11. On Mar. 20, 2009, the parties filed a Stipulation to Stay Pending Reexamination of the Patents-In-Suit (*see* Dkt. No. 42). Judge Fogel granted this request on Mar. 23, 2009 CMC,

setting a Status Conference for Sep. 25, 2009 (*see* Dkt. No. 44). The Order granting the Stay was filed on Mar. 24, 2009 (*see* Dkt. No. 43).

- 12. On Sep. 25, 2009, Judge Fogel continued the Stay, setting a Status Conference for Mar. 26, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 45).
- 13. On Mar. 26, 2010, Judge Fogel set a Status Conference for May 7, 2010 (see Dkt. No. 48).
- 14. On Apr. 30, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Case Management Statement setting forth a proposed case schedule (*see* Dkt. No. 52).
- 15. On May 7, 2010, Judge Fogel lifted the Stay and adopted the proposed case schedule filed by the parties on Apr. 30, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 53).
- 16. On Jun. 24, 2010, Plaintiff Lenovo, filed an Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time requesting that the deadlines adopted by the Court in its May 7, 2010 Order be extended by seven days (*see* Dkt. No. 56). Judge Fogel granted this request on July 27, 2010, setting the Claim Construction Hearing for Feb. 22, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 58).
- 17. On Aug. 12, 2010, Defendant Shuttle, filed a Motion to Enlarge Time and To Modify the Case Schedule (*see* Dkt. No. 59). Judge Fogel granted this request on Aug. 18, 2010, and ordered the parties to submit a Proposed Stipulated Case Management Order with a revised case schedule by Aug. 31, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 64).
- 18. On Aug. 31, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Proposed Stipulated Case Management Order (*see* Dkt. No. 65), which Judge Fogel granted on Sep. 2, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 67).
- 19. On Nov. 19, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order to Continue the Hearing date on Defendant Shuttle's Motion to Strike Plaintiff Lenovo's Infringement Contentions (*see* Dkt. No. 79). Magistrate Judge Patricia Trumbull, granted this request, setting the hearing Joint Stipulation for Dec. 14, 2010 (*see* Dkt. No. 80).
- 20. On Nov. 23, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Enlarge Time to File the parties' Patent L.R. 4-3 Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement (Civil L.R. 6-2) (*see* Dkt. No. 81). On Nov. 23, 2010, the Court granted the parties' request (*see* Dkt. No. 82).

- 21. On Nov. 24, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Stay Pending Settlement Discussions (*see* Dkt. No. 83). On Nov. 30, 2010, the Court entered an Order granting the stay (*see* Dkt. No. 84).
- 22. On December 21, 2010, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Modify Case Management Order Pursuant to L.R. 6-2 (*see* Dkt. No. 85).

### **III.** Effect of Requested Stay

- 23. The parties request the Court stay the case and all case deadlines, Court imposed and discovery related, until February 24, 2010 pending settlement discussions.
- 24. In the event that a settlement cannot be reached, the parties request that the Court extend the current case deadlines set forth in the September 2, 2010 Joint Stipulated Case Management Order and modified by the Court's November 30, 2010 Order and the parties' December 21, 2010 Stipulation as set forth below:

Event	Schedule Established by September 2 Order	4-Week Extension Granted Pursuant to Nov. 30 Order	Additional Extension Requested by this Stipulation
Parties file Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement. Patent L.R. 4-3	November 23, 2010	December 21, 2010	March 28, 2011
Amended pleadings deadline	December 7, 2010	January 4, 2011	April 11, 2011
Deadline for completing discovery on issues relating to claim construction for the patents-in-suit. Patent L.R. 4-4	December 23, 2010	January 20, 2011	April 29, 2011
Lenovo files Opening Claim Construction Brief. Patent L.R. 4-5(a)	January 7, 2011	February 4, 2011	May 13, 2011
Shuttle files Opposition Claim Construction Brief.	January 21, 2011	February 18, 2010	May 27, 2011

1	Patent L.R. 4-5(b)				
2 3 4	Lenovo files Reply Claim Construction Brief. Patent L.R. 4-5(c)	January 28, 2011	February 25, 2011	June 3, 2011	
<ul><li>5</li><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>	Claim Construction Hearing	March 4, 2011	April 1, 2011	To be set by Court on a date convenient to the Court on or after July 1, 2011	
8 9 10 11	Parties relying upon advice of counsel to support any claim or defense must produce and serve all supporting documents. Patent L.R. 3-7.	50 days after issuance of Claim Construction Order	50 days after issuance of Claim Construction Order	50 days after issuance of Claim Construction Order	
12					
13	FOR THE ABOVE REASONS, the parties respectfully request that the Court enter an order				
14	staying this case and all deadlines until February 24, 2011.				
15	SO STIPULATED:				
16	Respectfully submitted,				
17 18	Dated: January 3, 2011	A	KIN GUMP STRAUSS F	HAUER & FELD LLP	
19		-			
20	By: /s/ Fred I. Williams FRED I. WILLIAMS				
21	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
22		1	LENOVO (SINGAPORE)	) PIE. LTD.	
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28		5			

1	Dated: January 3, 2011	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
2	Dated. January 3, 2011	SIDLET AUSTIN ELI
3		
4		By: /s/ PETER H. KANG <sup>1</sup>
5		
6		Attorneys for Defendants SHUTTLE, INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP, INC.
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to General Order 45(X), the filer of this docum document has been obtained from Peter H. Kang.	nent hereby attests that concurrence in the filing of the
28		6

## -{PROPOSED}-ORDER

### PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The case is stayed and all case deadlines, Court imposed and discovery related, are stayed until February 24, 2010 pending settlement discussions; and
- 2. In the event a settlement cannot be reached, the current case deadlines set forth in the Joint Stipulated Case Management Order (Dkt. No. 67) entered by this Court on September 2, 2010 and modified pursuant to the Court's November 30, 2010 Order and the parties' December 21, 2010 Stipulation will be extended as follows:

March 28, 2011	Parties file Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement. Patent L.R. 4-3
April 11, 2011	Amended pleadings deadline.
April 29, 2011	Deadline for completing discovery on issues relating to claim construction for the patents-in-suit.  Patent L.R. 4-4
May 13, 2011	Lenovo files Opening Claim Construction Brief. Patent L.R. 4-5(a)
May 27, 2011	Shuttle files Opposition Claim Construction Brief. Patent L.R. 4-5(b)
June 3, 2011	Lenovo files Reply Claim Construction Brief. Patent L.R. 4-5(c)
[To be set by Court on a date convenient to the Court on or after July 1, 2011]	Claim Construction Hearing.
50 days after issuance of Claim Construction Order	Parties relying upon advice of counsel to support any claim or defense must produce and serve all supporting documents.  Patent L.R. 3-7.

Dated: \_\_\_\_1/5/2011

HO PRABLE JEI ALY FOGEL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE