

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

PA ADVISORS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:07-CV-480 (DF)

ORDER

Currently before the Court is a motion entitled “Motion for Reconsideration & clarification Motion to Intervene as Plaintiff’s under Fed R. Civ P. rule 24(A)2, 24(B) Motion for Brief of Amicus Curiae, Friend of the Court,” signed by Jonathan Lee Riches and Albert J. Pirro. Dkt. No. 222. Also before the Court is the Plaintiff’s and Defendants’ Joint Opposition in Response. Dkt. No. 225. For the reasons stated below, these Motions will be **DENIED**.

Although the one-page handwritten document is headed as three motions, the Court finds substance lacking to support any of the three headings. Riches and Pirro fail to specify which ruling needs the reconsideration and clarification of this Court. Further, neither is a party to this case, so any reconsideration and clarification request is improper. As to Riches and Pirro’s motion to intervene, their motion fails to disclose any information relating to the subject-matter of this case, namely patent infringement. Mr. Riches conclusory statements regarding “Federal Law violations” committed against PA Advisors by Google are unfounded and have no connection to the patent infringement lawsuit before this Court. Additionally, the parties collectively oppose this intervention and know of no connection between these individuals and this lawsuit. Finally, Riches and Pirro’s motion for Brief of Amicus Curiae likewise contains no support and states no connection with the patent infringement action pending before this Court.

For the foregoing reasons, Jonathan Lee Riches and Albert J. Pirro's Motions (Dkt. No. 222) are hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 30th day of December, 2008.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Folsom", written over a horizontal line.

DAVID FOLSOM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE