

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

<p>SILICON LABORATORIES INC.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>CRESTA TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Case No. 5:14-cv-03227-PSG</p> <p>ORDER RE: CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEFING SCHEDULE DISPUTE</p> <p>(Re: Docket No. 102)</p>
---	--	---

Plaintiff Silicon Laboratories Inc. presents a dispute between the parties about the claim construction briefing schedule in place in this case. Silicon Labs takes the position that the patent local rules only provide for one set of claim construction briefing, and as the party claiming patent infringement, it is Silicon Labs—and Silicon Labs alone—that was entitled to file an opening claim construction brief on August 3, 2015. Defendant Cresta Technology Corporation disagrees, evidenced by the fact that it filed its own opening claim construction brief on August 3 as well. The patent local rules are clear: absent a stipulation by the parties or a court order allowing such a process, only a single set of claim construction briefing papers—that is one opening brief, one opposition brief and one reply brief—is permitted.¹

Cresta Tech’s opening claim construction brief² is STRICKEN. Cresta Tech may re-file the same brief as an opposition or it may recast the brief to address Silicon Labs’s opening brief.

¹ See Pat. L.R. 4-5.


² See Docket No. 100.

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

Pursuant to the scheduling order in this case, any opposition is due August 17, 2015 and any reply by Silicon Labs is due August 24, 2015.³

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 10, 2015



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge

³ See Docket No. 36.