

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.: 12-CV-00630-LHK
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER REGARDING STAY AND
	)	CASE NARROWING AND
v.	)	CONTINUING THE CASE
	)	MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a	)	
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG	)	
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York	)	
corporation; and SAMSUNG	)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,	)	
a Delaware limited liability company,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a	)	
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG	)	
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York	)	
corporation; and SAMSUNG	)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,	)	
a Delaware limited liability company,	)	
	)	
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
APPLE, INC., a California corporation,	)	
	)	
Counterclaim-Defendant.)	)	
	)	

On March 7, 2013, the parties in this action filed a joint status report regarding whether they believed that a stay of this litigation was appropriate pending resolution of the appeal of the

1 parties' separate litigation in Civil Action No. 11-CV-01846-LHK (the "1846 Case"). See ECF  
2 No. 393.

3 "The District Court has broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident to its power to  
4 control its own docket." *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997). In light of the parties' joint  
5 status report, the Court will not stay the case. Accordingly, Defendants Samsung Electronics Co.,  
6 Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., and Samsung Telecommunications America, LLC shall  
7 not file a motion seeking this administrative relief. If circumstances change, the Court will notify  
8 the parties.

9 As this case proceeds, the Court will require the parties to streamline the issues raised in  
10 this action significantly. Therefore, within ten days after the Court issues its Claim Construction  
11 Order, the parties will be required to limit their asserted patent claims and accused products to  
12 twenty-five per side. In addition, the parties will be required to further narrow their asserted patent  
13 claims and accused products as well as limit their prior art references: before the close of expert  
14 discovery, before the Court considers any motions for summary judgment, after the Court rules on  
15 any motions for summary judgment, and again before the pretrial conference. Further, the parties  
16 will be required to limit the number of consulting and testifying experts. Unlike in the 1846 Case,  
17 the Court will not permit the parties to involve over fifty experts in this litigation.

18 The Case Management Conference currently scheduled for March 27, 2013, is hereby  
19 CONTINUED to April 24, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. In the parties' joint case management statement, the  
20 parties shall make a proposal as to the narrowing of this case consistent with this Order.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22  
23 Dated: March 8, 2013

24   
25 LUCY H. KOH  
26 United States District Judge  
27  
28