HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

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 clerk shall TERMINATE Defendants' motion to seal (Dkt. # 512) and shall UNSEAL the document that is the subject of that motion (Dkt. # 513). Plaintiff has indicated that it has no objection to unsealing those documents.

The court GRANTS the parties' stipulated motion to modify certain case schedule deadlines. Dkt. # 519. In particular, the court confirms that it will hold a pretrial conference on August 22, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. The parties contend that they have "objections to exhibits and other issues" that they would like to address at that conference. The court assumes that those objections and issues go beyond those stated in the parties' motions in limine. If the parties would like the court to consider the issues, they must submit a joint statement no later than noon on August 18. If the court intends to hear argument on any portion of the parties' motions in limine, it will notify the parties in advance of the portions of the motions that require argument.

ORDER - 1

The parties shall follow the modified deadlines they state in their stipulated motion. The parties need not submit video excerpts of depositions in advance of trial unless the court orders otherwise.

Finally, the court notes that the parties have begun to file a relatively steady stream of stipulations reflecting their agreement on the presentation of evidence at trial. The parties have presented all of those stipulations for the court's signature. The court appreciates the parties' cooperation, but the court will not sign stipulations that merely reflect the parties' agreements. The court will hold the parties to their agreements, and to the extent they feel it is necessary, they may file their stipulations for the record. But the court will sign stipulations only if the court orders relief, and will comment on stipulations only if it declines to accept them in whole or in part. The court reminds the parties that their attorneys and staff overwhelmingly outnumber court staff and the undersigned judge, and the court has more than 200 other cases to deal with. The parties' cooperation has been admirable; the court urges them to apply the same cooperative spirit to reducing the burden this case imposes on the limited resources of the court. They should request action from the court only when it is necessary.

One of the parties' stipulations reflects the parties' agreement to present the testimony of two witnesses who live in Taiwan by videoconference. Dkt. # 511. The court accepts that agreement, except that it notes that it will begin a trial day early or end it late only if absolutely necessary. The court believes that respect for the jurors, who will bear an extraordinary burden in this case, demands that the court not alter the daily schedule for the convenience of the parties.

Dated this 8th day of August, 2014.

ORDER – 2

The Honorable Richard A. Jones United States District Court Judge

Richard A Jones