

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

LANTIQ DEUTSCHLAND GMBH, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
RALINK TEHCNOLOGY CORPORATION, )  
ET AL., )  
Defendants. )

Case No.: 5:11-CV-0234 EJD  
**FURTHER CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**  
**(Re: Docket No. 170)**

Based on the Joint Case Management Conference Statement and the recent appearances of counsel for MediaTek USA, Inc. and MediaTek Wireless, Inc. (collectively "MediaTek"), the court VACATES the case management conference scheduled for May 18, 2012.


On April 30, 2012, the court granted Plaintiff Lantiq North America, Inc. and Plaintiff Lantiq Deutschland GMBH's (collectively "Lantiq") motion to amend their complaint to allege infringement of the '799 patent and the '904 patent against MediaTek and to add new accused products. It appears from the docket that MediaTek has been served. See Docket Nos. 174-175. In light of the additional parties and products accused of infringing the '799 patent and the '904 patent, the court finds it appropriate to set a schedule that would permit MediaTek to participate in claims construction regarding the '799 patent and the '904 patent. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the claims construction hearing and the tutorial regarding the '799 patent and the '904 patent scheduled for May 30, 2012 are VACATED. The claims

1 construction hearing, hearing on the motion for summary judgment, and the tutorial regarding the  
2 '116 patent remain on calendar for May 30, 2012.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, no later than May 18, 2012 at 3 p.m., the parties,  
4 including MediaTek, shall file an updated joint case management conference statement including a  
5 proposed schedule for claims regarding the '799 and '904 patents. The parties shall also file a joint  
6 statement addressing whether the claims regarding the '116 patent should proceed according to the  
7 current schedule or on the same schedule as the '799 and the '904 patents.

8 Dated: May 16, 2012

9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 EDWARD J. DAVILA  
12 United States District Judge