

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 Claude M. Stern (Bar No. 96737)
 2 claudestern@quinnemanuel.com
 Patrick Doolittle (Bar No. 203659)
 3 patrickdoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 4 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 5 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

6 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE Ltd.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

11 INTERSERVE, INC. dba TECHCRUNCH, a
 Delaware corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,
 12 INC., a Delaware corporation,
 13 Plaintiffs,
 14 vs.
 15 FUSION GARAGE PTE LTD., a Singapore
 company,
 16 Defendant.
 17

CASE NO. C 09-cv-5812 RS (PVT)
**FUSION GARAGE'S MOTION TO
 SHORTEN TIME ON ITS MOTION TO
 COMPEL COMPLIANCE**
 (CIV L.R. 6-3)

1 **MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME**

2 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, Defendant Fusion Garage PTE., Ltd. (“Fusion Garage”)
3 respectfully requests that the Court hear Fusion Garage’s Motion to Compel Compliance on
4 shortened time. The Motion to Compel requires urgent action because plaintiffs have filed a
5 Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (“PI Motion”) yet have produced only a few hundred pages of
6 documents. Fusion Garage served its Requests for Production months ago, and plaintiffs agreed in
7 written discovery responses and written supplemental discovery response that they would be
8 producing documents. To date, with a PI Motion pending, plaintiffs have only produced a small
9 number of documents and are prejudicing Fusion Garage’s ability to (i) take a 30(b)(6) deposition
10 related to the opposition to the PI motion; and (ii) prepare their opposition to the PI Motion.

11 As Fusion Garage’s opposition to the PI motion is due April 15, 2010, Fusion Garage
12 respectfully requests that the Court hear the Motion to Compel on Wednesday April 7, 2010 with
13 Plaintiffs’ opposition due by Monday, April 5, 2010. The Motion to Compel raises a
14 straightforward issue—i.e., should Plaintiffs be required to immediately produce documents they
15 agreed to produce—so Plaintiffs’ opposition should require little effort.

16 In accordance with the declaration requirement of Local Rule 6-3, Fusion Garage
17 respectfully refers the Court to the Declaration of Patrick C. Doolittle in support of Fusion
18 Garage’s Motion to Compel Compliance.

19
20 Respectfully submitted,

21 DATED: April 2, 2010

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

22
23
24 By /s/ Patrick Doolittle
Patrick C. Doolittle
25 Attorneys for Defendant fusion Garage PTE Ltd.
26
27
28