1	Tipple 8 cites. Septemeer 17, 2
2	Samsung's response: October
3	Apple's reply: October 8, 201
4	In their briefs regarding the appropria
5	Apple's motion for ongoing royalties
6	Pylon Mfg. Corp., 719 F.3d 1305 (Fed
7	515 Fed. Appx. 882 (Fed. Cir. 2012).
8	The December 18, 2014 hearing
9	parties' briefs.
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	Dated: September 9, 2014
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Apple's brief: September 17, 2014, not exceeding 5 pages
Samsung's response: October 1, 2014, not exceeding 5 pages
Apple's reply: October 8, 2014, not exceeding 3 pages
r briefs regarding the appropriate royalty rate, the parties shall also address the effect of
's motion for ongoing royalties on entry of final judgment, in light of <i>Robert Bosch</i> , <i>LLC v</i> .
Mfg. Corp., 719 F.3d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2013), and Warsaw Orthopedic, Inc. v. NuVasive, Inc.,

The December 18, 2014 hearing date remains as set pending the Court's review of the briefs.

O ORDERED.

United States District Judge

Case No.: 12-CV-00630-LHK ORDER RE: BRIEFING OF APPLE'S MOTION FOR ONGOING ROYALTIES