

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

ADAPTIX, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. C 13-1774 PJH

v.

**NOTICE OF PENDING MOTION TO
RELATE CASES**

MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

Before the court is a motion to relate the following six cases:

1. No. 13-1774, Adaptix v. Motorola Mobility LLC, et al.
2. No. 13-1776, Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.
3. No. 13-1777, Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.
4. No. 13-1778, Adaptix v. AT&T Mobility LLC, et al.
5. No. 13-1844, Adaptix v. Cellco Partnership, et al.
6. No. 13-2023, Adaptix v. Apple, Inc., et al.

The motion was filed by defendant Motorola Mobility LLC in this case, and a statement of non-opposition was filed by plaintiff Adaptix. The other defendant in this case, Cellco Partnership (d/b/a Verizon Wireless) filed a statement in support of Motorola's motion. However, no other parties have filed a response - either to support relation or to object to it. It appears that no notice of Motorola's motion was given to the parties in the other cases, so the court provides such notice with this order.

The court also notes that all parties in case no. 13-1844 have consented to proceed before Magistrate Judge Grewal. While some defendants in the other Adaptix cases have filed declinations to proceed before another magistrate judge, they have not indicated whether they would similarly decline to proceed before Magistrate Judge Grewal.

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

Thus, each party is directed to file a statement, no later than **May 28, 2013**,
addressing these two issues:

- (1) whether the party supports or opposes Motorola's motion to relate all six cases;
- (2) whether the party would consent to proceed before Magistrate Judge Grewal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 20, 2013



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge