

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

11 APPLE, INC., a California corporation, ) Case No.: 12-CV-00630-LHK  
12 )  
13 Plaintiff, ) CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER;  
14 ) ORDER DENYING SAMSUNG'S  
15 v. ) MOTION TO AMEND THE CASE  
16 ) MANAGEMENT ORDER AND FOR  
17 SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., a ) LEAVE TO AMEND ITS ANSWER TO  
18 Korean corporation; SAMSUNG ) APPLE'S COUNTERCLAIMS IN  
19 ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York ) REPLY; ORDER DENYING  
20 corporation; and SAMSUNG ) SAMSUNG'S MOTION FOR RELIEF  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, ) FROM NONDISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL  
a Delaware limited liability company, ) ORDER OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

21 Clerk: Martha Parker Brown  
Reporter: Lee-Anne Shortridge

Plaintiff's Attorneys: Josh Krevitt, Mark Lyon, Mark Reiter,  
Bill Lee, Mark Selwyn  
Defendants' Attorneys: Victoria Maroulis, Kevin Johnson,  
Alexander Baxter, Marissa Ducca, Maxim Price

22  
23 A case management conference was held on July 31, 2013. A further case management  
24 conference is set for October 30, 2013, at 2:00 p.m.

25 By August 2, 2013, the parties shall file stipulations of dismissal without prejudice  
26 regarding the patents, claims, and accused products that the parties have dropped from the case.  
27

1 In regard to the parties' invalidity "references/systems/combinations," the Court clarified  
2 that each combination must be identified separately an count towards the numerical limit on  
3 invalidity references/systems/combinations.

4 The parties agree to meet and confer regarding the counting of accused products after  
5 expert discovery.

6 For the reasons stated on the record, the Court DENIED Samsung's Motion to Amend the  
7 Case Management Order and for Leave to Amend Its Answer to Apple's Counterclaims in Reply.  
8 See ECF No. 535-1.

9 For the reasons stated on the record, the Court also DENIED Samsung's Motion for Relief  
10 from Nondispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge. See ECF No. 680-3. Accordingly, the  
11 Court DENIED as MOOT Samsung's request to set a briefing schedule on this motion.

12 The Court amended the case schedule as follows:

13 By September 27, 2013, the parties will be required to dismiss without prejudice one patent  
14 from the case so that neither side will be asserting more than five patents. In addition, the parties  
15 will be required to limit their asserted claims to 10 per side and limit their accused products to 15  
16 per side.

17 By September 30, 2013, the parties will be required to reduce their invalidity  
18 references/systems/combinations to 25 per side.

19 By February 6, 2014, the parties will be required to limit their asserted claims to 5 per side  
20 and limit their accused products to 10 per side. In addition, the parties will be required to reduce  
21 their invalidity references/systems/combinations to 15 per side.

22 During expert discovery, each side will be limited to 15 experts and 15 opening expert  
23 reports. Each side shall be limited to filing no more than 5 Daubert motions in this case. At trial,  
24 each side shall be limited to no more than 12 testifying experts.

Scheduled Event	Date
Initial Expert Disclosures	August 12, 2013
Rebuttal Expert Reports	September 13, 2013
Close of Expert Discovery	September 27, 2013
Last Day to File Dispositive Motions	October 3, 2013
Opposition Briefs on Dispositive Motions	October 29, 2013
Reply Briefs on Dispositive Motions	November 14, 2013
Hearing on Dispositive Motions	December 12, 2013, at 1:30 p.m.
Hearing on Daubert motions	January 23, 2014, at 1:30 p.m.
Final Pretrial Conference	March 5, 2014, at 2:00 p.m.
Jury Trial	March 31, 2014, at 9:00 a.m.

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

Length of Trial

12 days

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 31, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LUCY H. KOH  
United States District Judge