

E-Filed 6/25/10

1 Chad S. Campbell
Perkins Coie Brown & Bain P.A.
2 2901 North Central Avenue
Suite 2000
3 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2755
602-351-8000
4 Fax: 602-648-7000
Email: cscampbell@perkinscoie.com

5 Lauren Sliger
6 Perkins Coie LLP
1888 Century Park East
7 Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1721
8 310-788-9900
Fax: 310-788-3399
9 Email: lsliger@perkinscoie.com

10 Farschad Farzan
Christopher Kao
11 Perkins Coie LLP
Four Embarcadero Center
12 Suite 2400
San Francisco, CA 94111
13 415-344-7000
Fax: 415-344-7050
14 Email: ffarzan@perkinscoie.com
Email: ckao@perkinscoie.com

15 Attorneys for Plaintiff
16 MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Morgan Chu (SBN 70446)
Perry Goldberg (SBN 168976)
Samuel Lu (SBN 171969)
IRELL & MANELLA LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, California 90067-4276
Telephone: (310) 277-1010
Facsimile: (310) 203-7199
E-mail: mchu@irell.com
E-mail: pgoldberg@irell.com
E-mail: slu@irell.com

Attorneys for Defendant
TIVO INC.

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 SAN JOSE DIVISION

20 MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
21 Plaintiff

22 v.

23 TIVO INC.,
24 Defendant.

) Case No. 5:10-cv-00240-RS

) JOINT STIPULATION FOR
) A MODIFICATION OF THE
) COURT'S CASE MANAGEMENT
) SCHEDULING ORDER

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-1, 6-2, and 7-12, the undersigned counsel hereby jointly
3 request an order changing time that would affect the dates of certain claim construction events set
4 forth in the Court's Case Management Scheduling Order. In addition, pursuant to Civil Local Rule
5 7-12, the undersigned counsel jointly request a modification of certain discovery limitations set
6 forth in the Court's Case Management Scheduling Order.
7

8 II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULING

9 A. Reasons for the Requested Enlargement

10 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(1), the reasons for the requested enlargement of time
11 are as follows.

- 12 • This case presently involves two patents asserted by Microsoft against TiVo. Dkt.
13 No. 1.
- 14 • On May 27, 2010, Microsoft served TiVo with its asserted claims and infringement
15 contentions for the original two patents as specified in the Case Management
16 Scheduling Order. Dkt No. 23.
- 17 • On May 31, 2010, Microsoft filed a motion to amend seeking to assert five
18 additional patents against TiVo. Dkt. No. 27. One week later, on June 7, 2010,
19 Microsoft served TiVo with its asserted claims and infringement contentions for the
20 five additional patents.
- 21 • TiVo filed a statement of non-opposition in which TiVo offered not to oppose
22 Microsoft's motion to amend so long as appropriate adjustments were made to the
23 existing Case Management Scheduling Order. Dkt. No. 32.
24
25
26
27
28

- 1 • The parties agreed, in principle, to extend the current claim construction deadlines
2 by approximately three months, if the Court were to grant Microsoft's motion to
3 amend. Dkt. No. 32.
- 4 • Under the parties' proposed schedule, TiVo would have slightly over five months
5 from when TiVo received notice of Microsoft's five additional patents (i.e., when
6 Microsoft filed its motion to amend) in which to serve TiVo's invalidity
7 contentions, which is approximately the same amount of time that TiVo would
8 have to prepare invalidity contentions had Microsoft filed a separate case. (In *SAP*
9 *Aktiengesellschaft v. I2 Technologies, Inc.*, 250 F.R.D. 472, 475 (N.D. Cal. 2008),
10 the court (1) granted plaintiff's opposed motion to amend to add a new patent to the
11 case and (2) gave the defendant 189 days from the date of the plaintiff's motion to
12 amend in which to serve the defendant's invalidity contentions.)
- 13 • The parties have thus reached agreement regarding both Microsoft's motion to
14 amend and TiVo's request to modify the claim construction schedule.

15 For the foregoing reasons, the parties' jointly requested enlargement of time is reasonable.

16 B. Previous Time Modifications

17 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(2), the parties disclose that the only previous time
18 modification in this case was a joint stipulation giving TiVo a thirty-day extension of time to
19 answer, plead, or otherwise respond to Microsoft's complaint.

20 C. Effect the Requested Modification Would Have on the Schedule

21 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(3), the parties submit the following proposal for a
22 modified claim construction schedule. The proposal describes the effect that the requested
23 modification would have on the current claim construction schedule:
24
25
26
27
28

<u>Claim Construction Event</u>	<u>Current Date</u>	<u>Proposed Date</u>
Invalidity Contentions	July 26, 2010	November 4, 2010
Exchange Proposed Terms for Construction	August 9, 2010	November 18, 2010
Exchange Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence	August 30, 2010	December 9, 2011
Joint Claim Construction and Expert Reports	September 24, 2010	January 6, 2011
Motion to Amend the Pleadings	October 1, 2010	January 13, 2011
Completion of Claim Construction Discovery	October 22, 2010	February 3, 2011
Opening Claim Construction Brief	November 8, 2010	February 17, 2011
Responsive Claim Construction Brief	November 22, 2010	March 3, 2011
Reply Claim Construction Brief	December 1, 2010	March 10, 2011
Tutorial	January 26, 2011	1 week before Claim Construction Hearing
Claim Construction Hearing	February 2, 2011	Early May 2011
Further Case Management Conference	March 3, 2011	1 month after Claim Construction Hearing

III. DISCOVERY LIMITATIONS

The Court ordered the following relevant discovery limitations in the Case Management Scheduling Order:

- (a) fifteen (15) non-expert depositions per party, including depositions contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6);

1 (d) fifty requests for admission per party (exclusive of requests for admission
2 seeking document identification).

3 If the Court were to grant Microsoft's motion to amend, the parties would agree to a
4 proposed modification of these discovery limitations as follows:

5 (a)(1) twenty-three (23) non-expert depositions per party, including depositions
6 contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6), with both parties having the right to seek
7 leave of court for additional depositions if necessary;

8 (a)(2) Joseph H. Matthews, III (one of the inventor-witnesses named on four
9 different patents) may be deposed for up to ten (10) hours;

10 (d) seventy requests for admission per party (exclusive of requests for admission
11 seeking document identification).
12

13
14 The proposed discovery limitations are reasonable and appropriate given that, if
15 Microsoft's motion to amend were granted, the number of patents in this case would increase from
16 two to seven patents and the number of possible inventor-witnesses would increase from five to
17 thirteen possible inventor-witnesses.

18 IV. STIPULATION

19 THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE, by and through their respective counsel, and
20 respectfully request that the Court modify the Court's Case Management Scheduling Order as
21 follows:
22

23 1. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULING

24

<u>Claim Construction Event</u>	<u>New Date</u>
Invalidity Contentions	November 4, 2010
Exchange Proposed Terms for Construction	November 18, 2010

25
26
27
28

1	Exchange Preliminary Claim Constructions and Extrinsic Evidence	December 9, 2011
2		
3	Joint Claim Construction and Expert Reports	January 6, 2011
4		
5	Motion to Amend the Pleadings	January 13, 2011
6	Completion of Claim Construction Discovery	February 3, 2011
7		
8	Opening Claim Construction Brief	February 17, 2011
9	Responsive Claim Construction Brief	March 3, 2011
10	Reply Claim Construction Brief	March 10, 2011
11	Tutorial	1 week before Claim Construction Hearing May 11, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.
12		
13	Claim Construction Hearing	Early May 2011 May 18, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.
14	Further Case Management Conference	1 month after Claim Construction Hearing June 23, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.
15		

16

17 2. DISCOVERY

18 Discovery limitations shall be modified as follows:

- 19 (a)(1) twenty-three (23) non-expert depositions per party, including depositions
- 20 contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6), with both parties having the right to seek
- 21 leave of court for additional depositions if necessary;
- 22
- 23 (a)(2) Joseph H. Matthews, III (one of the inventor-witnesses named on four
- 24 different patents) may be deposed for up to ten (10) hours;
- 25
- 26 (d) seventy requests for admission per party (exclusive of requests for admission
- 27 seeking document identification).

28 All other discovery limitations shall remain the same.

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
28

Dated: June 24, 2010

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
Attorneys for Defendant
TiVo Inc.


By: /s/ Samuel K. Lu
Samuel K. Lu

PERKINS COIE LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Microsoft Corporation

By: /s/ Lauren Sliger
Lauren Sliger

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED

Date: 6/25/10



Hon. Richard Seeborg
United States District Judge