

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

Video Enhancement Solutions, L.L.C., :

Plaintiff, :

v. :

Denon Electronics (USA), L.L.C., :
et al., :

Defendants. :

AND :

Video Enhancement Solutions, L.L.C., :

Plaintiff, :

v. :

Creative Labs, Inc., :
et al., :

Defendants. :

CIVIL ACTION NO.
1:09-cv-03391-JOF

CIVIL ACTION NO.
1:10-cv-00748-JOF

OPINION & ORDER

It has come to the court's attention that these two cases are related in that they are filed by the same Plaintiff, Video Enhancement Solutions, LLC, and concern Patent Nos.

7,397,965 and 7,492,960 both entitled “Method of Encoding a Blocking Artifact When Coding Moving Picture.”

The court DIRECTS the Clerk of the Court to CONSOLIDATE these cases and all pleadings should be filed in Civil Action No. 09-CV-3391-JOF.

The court also notes that certain Defendants in Civil Action No. 09-CV-3391-JOF have filed a motion to transfer venue noting that more of the entities involved in this litigation have a connection to California than to Georgia. *See* Civil Action No. 09-CV-3391-JOF, Docket Entry [52].

The court DIRECTS each Defendant within twenty (20) days to advise the court of its position with respect to a potential transfer. After that time, the court will rule on Defendants Epson America, Inc.; Onkyo U.S.A. Corporation; and Yamaha Electronics Corporation, USA’s motion.

In Civil Action No. 09-CV-3391-JOF, the court GRANTS Defendants’ unopposed motion for extension of time to respond [57].

In Civil Action No. 10-cv-748-JOF, the court GRANTS Defendant Seagate Technology LLC’s unopposed motion for extension of time to file answer [19], GRANTS Plaintiff’s unopposed motion for extension of time to file answer [20], GRANTS Defendant Philips Electronics North America Corp.’s unopposed motion for extension of time to file answer [22], GRANTS Defendant Panasonic Corporation of North America, Inc.’s motion

for extension of time to file answer [25], GRANTS Defendant Pioneer Electronics (USA), Inc.'s motion for extension of time to file answer [26], and GRANTS Plaintiff's unopposed motion for extension of time to file answer [27].

IT IS SO ORDERED this 7th day of April 2010.

 /s J. Owen Forrester
J. OWEN FORRESTER
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE