

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-1207RAJ

ORDER

The court has reviewed the parties' stipulation accepting the court's proposal to begin trial on September 8, 2014 and conclude it no later than October 24, 2014. The court directs the clerk to set a September 8, 2014 trial date.

The court has also reviewed the stipulated motion in which Plaintiff and Defendant Chungwha Picture Tubes, Ltd. inform the court that they have reached a settlement. They ask that the court excuse Chungwha from pretrial participation pending the completion of its settlement obligations. No party has objected. The court GRANTS the motion (Dkt. # 422) and orders that Chungwha has no further pretrial obligations unless the court orders otherwise. The parties shall promptly file a stipulation for dismissal when Chungwha has completed its settlement obligations. The court notifies Chungwha and other parties that it will not delay trial in the event that Chungwha and Plaintiff are ultimately unable to perfect their settlement.

1 All parties are on notice that the court is holding open an extraordinary amount of
2 time for their trial. That decision will severely constrain the court's ability to schedule
3 other matters for nearly two months. The parties are therefore jointly responsible for
4 promptly informing the court of any developments that will impact trial or its length.

5 The parties previously requested that the court grant them 30 days following its
6 order setting a trial date to prepare a joint statement regarding necessary pretrial
7 proceedings. The court accordingly orders the parties to file a joint status report no later
8 than November 7, 2014. That report need not address the trial date, but they shall address
9 a schedule for motions in limine and any other pretrial motions. Given the proceedings in
10 the MDL court, the court is not inclined to permit pretrial motions other than motions in
11 limine, but will consider the parties' requests. Any party who wishes to file a motion
12 other than a motion in limine shall be specific about what motion(s) it intends to bring
13 and why that motion is necessary. When the parties meet and confer, they must consider
14 the court's local rules, which impose default deadlines for the submission of jury
15 instructions, impose restrictions on motions in limine, and otherwise establish pretrial
16 procedures.

17 DATED this 7th day of October, 2013.

18
19 

20 _____
21 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
22 United States District Court Judge
23
24
25
26
27