

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
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA ANA DIVISION

UNILOC 2017 LLC, Plaintiff, v. NETSUITE, INC., Defendant.	Case No. 8:19-cv-01151-JLS-DFM ORDER CONTINUING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
---	---

1 This matter is before the Court on the parties' stipulation to continue the
2 Scheduling Conference until November 8, 2019. The parties seek a one-week
3 continuance to consolidate the Scheduling Conference in this matter with the
4 Scheduling Conference date in a related case (against a different Defendant). Upon
5 review, the Court notes that two motions are pending in this case, the resolution of
6 which are likely to impact scheduling.¹ Therefore, the Court CONTINUES the
7 Scheduling Conference in this case to January 31, 2020² at 10:30 a.m.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 **DATED:** October 29, 2019



10
11 Hon. Josephine L. Staton
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 ¹ Defendant moves to dismiss the First Amended Complaint based in part upon a claim construction
ruling on the asserted patents issued by the Eastern District of Texas. (Doc. 27.) Defendant also
moves to stay non-claim construction discovery in this case. (Doc. 30.)

25 ² As a matter of practice, the Court usually issues a scheduling order based on the written submission
26 of the parties. The parties are directed to file an amended a Joint Rule 26(f) Report two weeks in
advance of the continued Scheduling Conference. The parties are advised that absent extraordinary
27 circumstances, the Court sets a full pretrial schedule; thus, in most instances, proposals like those
made by the parties' here (*see* Doc. 29-1) would be rejected, and the Court would calculate its
presumptive schedule based on the Scheduling Conference date. Here, the Court continues the
28 Scheduling Conference because the pending motions require the Court to give further consideration to