1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

AEVOE CORP., a California corporation,)
)
Plaintiff,)
VS.)
)
AE TECH CO., LTD., a Taiwan corporation;)
S&F Corporation dba SF PLANET)
CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation,)
and GREATSHIELD INC., a Minnesota)
corporation,)
Defendants.)

Case No.: 2:12-cv-00053-GMN-RJJ

ORDER

11 Pending before the Court is the Motion to Strike Defendants' Unauthorized Opening 12 Claim Construction Brief (ECF No. 182) filed by Plaintiff Aevoe Corp. ("Plaintiff"). 13 In this case, Plaintiff filed its Opening Claim Construction Brief on November 19, 2012. 14 (ECF No. 157.) On that same day, Defendants filed a brief styled as "Defendants' Opening 15 Claim Construction Brief." (ECF No. 159.) However, such a filing is not authorized by the 16 local rule governing claim construction briefing. See LCR 16.1-16. Specifically, Rule 16.1-16 17 of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada Local Rules of Practice authorizes 18 any party claiming infringement to file an "opening claim construction brief." Rule 16.1-16 further provides "[n]ot later than fourteen (14) days after service upon it of an opening brief, 19 20 each opposing party shall serve and file its responsive brief and supporting evidence." 21 However, Defendants failed to file a document styled as a "responsive brief." Therefore, rather 22 than strike Defendants' unauthorized brief, the Court construes Defendants' "Opening Claim 23 24

1	Construction Brief" as its response to Plaintiff's properly filed Opening Claim Construction
2	Brief. ¹ For these reasons, Plaintiff's Motion to Strike is DENIED .
3	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (ECF No. 182) is
4	DENIED.
5	DATED this 17 th day of December, 2012.
6	
7	ann
8	Gloria M. Navarro
9	United States District Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20 21	
21	
22	
23 24	
25	¹ The Court also notes that because Defendents' uncertherized Opening Claim Construction Drie ⁽²⁾ is construction
23	¹ The Court also notes that, because Defendants' unauthorized Opening Claim Construction Brief' is construed as its Responsive Claim Construction Brief, no further claim construction briefing by either party is authorized by Local Rule 16.1-16.