

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

APPLE, INC., a California corporation,)	Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
)	STRIKE
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A)	
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG)	
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)	
corporation; SAMSUNG)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,)	
a Delaware limited liability company,)	
Defendants.)	

Samsung has filed a motion to strike portions of several declarations filed in support of Apple’s motion for a permanent injunction. ECF No. 2032. Samsung has also filed a motion to shorten time for briefing on its motion to strike, ECF No. 2031, and Apple has opposed the motion to shorten time. ECF No. 2034. Samsung’s reason for striking the material is procedural: that the declarations serve to circumvent the page limits for Apple’s motion in violation of the Court’s Order Re: Post-Trial Proceedings issued on August 28, 2012, ECF No. 1945.

As the motion to strike is essentially an “evidentiary or procedural objection” to the permanent injunction motion, it must be contained within the opposition brief and subject to the opposition brief’s page limitations. See Civ. L. R. 7-3(a); see also Order Denying Motion for Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 452, at 5. Because Samsung filed the motion to strike separately

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

from the opposition, Samsung's motion to strike is DENIED. See Civ. L. R. 7-3(a). Samsung's motion to shorten time and Apple's opposition thereto are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 9, 2012



LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge