

1 CAROL LYNN THOMPSON (SBN 148079)
 2 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
 3 555 California Street
 4 San Francisco, CA 94104
 5 TELEPHONE: (415) 772-1200
 6 FACSIMILE: (415) 772-7400
 7 clthompson@sidley.com

8 Attorneys for Defendant
 9 KIMBERLY CLARK CORPORATION

KATHRYN G. SPELMAN (SBN 154512)
 DANIEL H. FINGERMAN (SBN 229683)
 MOUNT & STOELKER
 RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650
 333 West San Carlos Street
 San Jose, CA 95110-2740
 TELEPHONE: (408) 279-7000
 FACSIMILE: (408) 998-1473
 kspelman@mount.com
 dfingerman@mount.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY, INC.,)
 13)
 14 Plaintiff,)

v.)

15 AERO PRODUCTS INTERNATIONAL, INC.,)
 16 BP LUBRICANTS USA INC., BRH BRANDS,)
 17 INC., CALICO BRANDS, INC., COOPER)
 18 LIGHTING, LLC, DAREX LLC, DEXAS)
 19 INTERNATIONAL LTD., DYNA-GRO)
 20 NUTRITION SOLUTIONS, FISKARS)
 21 BRANDS, INC., GLOBAL CONCEPTS, INC.,)
 22 HOMAX PRODUCTS, INC., KIMBERLY-)
 23 CLARK CORPORATION, KRACO)
 24 ENTERPRISES LLC, LIXIT CORPORATION,)
 MEAD WESTVACO CORPORATION,)
 NUTRITION 21 INC., OATEY CO.,)
 OPTIMUM TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)
 NEWELL RUBBERMAID INC., SCHICK)
 MANUFACTURING, INC., THE SCOTTS)
 COMPANY LLC, STERLING)
 INTERNATIONAL, INC., VITAMIN POWER)
 INCORORATED, WOODSTREAM)
 CORPORATION, 4-D DESIGN, INC.,)

Defendants.)

Case No. 10-cv-02994 JF HRL

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO SEVER

1 Plaintiff San Francisco Technology, Inc. and Defendant Kimberly Clark Corporation
2 (“Kimberly Clark”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and agree that
3 defendant Kimberly Clark shall be severed from the case. This stipulation is made in light of the
4 Court’s ruling in *San Francisco Technologies, Inc. v. Glad Products, Co.*, 2010 Lexis 83681 (N.D.
5 Cal. 2010), where the Court determined that severance was appropriate in similar circumstances.
6 Subject to the Court’s approval, the parties request that the clerk open a new case number in *San*
7 *Francisco Technologies v. Kimberly Clark Corporation*.

8 IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED.

9 Dated: September 17, 2010

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

10
11 By: /s/ Carol Lynn Thompson
12 Carol Lynn Thompson
13 Attorneys for Defendant
Kimberly-Clark Corporation

14 Dated: September 17, 2010

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.

15
16 By: /s/ Dan Fingerman
17 Dan Fingerman
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
San Francisco Technology, Inc.

19
20 In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the below signatory attests that concurrence in the
21 filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory above.


22 Dated: September 17, 2010

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

23
24 By: /s/ Carol Lynn Thompson
25 Carol Lynn Thompson
26 Attorneys for Defendant
Kimberly-Clark Corporation

1 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFORE, IT IS**
2 **SO ORDERED.**

3
4 Dated: 9/27/10

By: 
The Honorable Jeremy D. Fogel

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28