

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION

4 ADAPTIX, INC.,) Case No. 5:13-cv-01774-PSG
5)
6 Plaintiff,)
7 v.)
8 MOTOROLA MOBILITY, LLC, *et al.*,)
9 Defendants.)

10 ADAPTIX, INC.,) Case No. 5:13-cv-01776-PSG
11)
12 Plaintiff,)
13 v.)
14 APPLE INC., *et al.*,)
15 Defendants.)

16 ADAPTIX, INC.,) Case No. 5:13-cv-01777-PSG
17)
18 Plaintiff,)
19 v.)
20 APPLE INC., *et al.*)
21 Defendants.)

22 ADAPTIX, INC.,) Case No. 5:13-cv-01844-PSG
23)
24 Plaintiff,)
25 v.)
26 CELLCO PARTNERSHIP *d/b/a*)
27 VERIZON WIRELESS, *et al.*,)
28 Defendants.)

ADAPTIX, INC.,) Case No. 5:13-cv-02023-PSG
Plaintiff,)
v.)
APPLE INC., *et al.*)
Defendants.)

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

The court has received word that Friday's hearing on the parties' various discovery disputes is no longer required. As the court understands it, since the initial hearing request, the parties have met on multiple occasions and hammered out a deal.

Based on this understanding, Friday's hearing is cancelled. In plenty of other cases, this court has highlighted and criticized weak attempts to meet-and-confer on discovery, especially in patent cases, the failure of which leave messes for the court to clean up. In this instance, however, counsel have done precisely the opposite. It is a safe bet that no party got everything it wanted, or even most of it. But such compromise speaks to good faith efforts on both sides. For that, the court wishes to say thanks

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 26, 2014



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge