trademark infringement under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) and liability on the Nevada Right of Publicity claim. The second phase of trial would address, if necessary, damages relating to the trademark claim.

26 ///

24

25

Plaintiffs' oppose Defendants' motion to bifurcate trial and argue that Defendants have failed to demonstrate good grounds to warrant a bifurcated trail under Rule 42 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Additionally, Plaintiffs argue that bifurcation of the trial would prejudice Plaintiffs as it would deprive them of their legitimate right to place before the jury the circumstances of the entire cause of action which they have brought.

Having read and considered Defendants fully briefed Motion to Bifurcate Trial, the Court finds that Defendants have failed to establish that a bifurcated trial is warranted in this case, or that bifurcation would serve the interests of convenience or judicial economy.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Bifurcate Trial (Doc. #205) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Surreply in Opposition (Doc. #217) is **DENIED.**

DATED: October 13, 2010.

PHILIP M. PRO

United States District Judge