

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

MIRROR WORLDS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:08-CV-88 LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

APPLE INC.,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

MIRROR WORLDS, LLC,
MIRROR WORLDS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Counterclaim Defendants.

**MIRROR WORLDS, LLC'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
EXCEED PAGE LIMIT FOR ITS OPPOSITIONS TO
APPLE INC.'S MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Pursuant to Local Rule CV-7(l), Plaintiff Mirror Worlds, LLC (“Mirror Worlds”) respectively submits this unopposed motion to exceed the page limit for Mirror Worlds’ oppositions to Apple’s five motions for summary judgment filed on July 22, 2010 (D.I. 250, 254-256, 258) opposing Apple Inc.’s (“Apple”) motions for Summary Judgment (D.I. 221, 223-226). Mirror Worlds’ five opposition briefs (filed July 22, 2010) (D.I. 250, 254-256, 258) totaled sixty pages, which Mirror Worlds believed was consistent with the sixty-page limit set forth in Local Rule CV-7(a)(3)(B). However, following such filings Apple advised that Mirror Worlds had exceeded the sixty-page limit by fifteen pages based on counting a sixth brief filed on January

15, 2010 (D.I. 163) in connection with the Court's *Markman* proceedings. Accordingly, Mirror Worlds hereby moves for leave to file fifteen extra pages (*i.e.*, an average of three extra pages per opposition). Mirror Worlds was unaware of its inadvertent mistake in calculating the pages until July 23, when Apple notified Mirror Worlds by email. Since then, Mirror Worlds has met and conferred with Apple in an attempt to reach an amicable resolution of the issue.

Apple has advised Mirror Worlds that it will not oppose Mirror Worlds' request so long as Apple receives 20 pages for its Summary Judgment Reply Briefs. Mirror Worlds is agreeable to Apple's request. Accordingly, the accompanying Proposed Order addresses both Mirror Worlds' and Apple's requests for extra pages.

Mirror Worlds respectfully requests that this Court allow it to exceed the page limits as it unintentionally did not account for its prior opposition brief. Alternatively, Mirror Worlds respectfully requests the Court allow Mirror Worlds to modify its responses to comply with the rules.

Dated: July 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alexander Solo

Otis Carroll, *Lead Counsel*

(Texas States Bar No. 03895700)

Deborah Race (Texas State Bar No. 16448700)

IRELAND CARROLL & KELLEY, P.C.

6101 S. Broadway, Suite 500

Tyler, Texas 75703

Tel: (903) 561-1600

Fax: (903) 581-1071

Email: Fedserv@icklaw.com

Joseph Diamante (*Pro Hac Vice*)

Kenneth L. Stein (*Pro Hac Vice*)

Ian G. DiBernardo (*Pro Hac Vice*)

Alexander Solo (*Pro Hac Vice*)

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP

180 Maiden Lane

New York, N.Y. 10038

Tel: (212) 806-5400
Email: asolo@stroock.com
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF,
MIRROR WORLDS, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

The undersigned counsel hereby certifies that Mirror Worlds counsel has in good faith conferred Apple's counsel in an effort to resolve the dispute without court action. Counsel of record for Mirror Worlds (Alexander Solo, together with Ian DiBernardo of Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP) conducted a telephonic meet and confer with Apple's counsel of record (Allan Soobert, Christian Platt) on July 27, 2010.

/s/ Alexander Solo

Alexander Solo

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document this 28th day of July, 2010, via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3).

/s/ Alexander Solo