	Case 5:15-cv-02008-EJD Document 95	Filed 05/06/16 Page 1 of 6
1	GEORGE A. RILEY (S.B. #118304) griley@omm.com	
2	LUANN L. SIMMONS (S.B. #203526)	
3	lsimmons@omm.com MELODY DRUMMOND HANSEN (S.B. #278	786)
4	mdrummondhansen@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
5	Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3823	
6	Telephone:(415) 984-8700Facsimile:(415) 984-8701	
7	RYAN K. YAGURA (S.B. #197619)	
8	ryagura@omm.com XIN-YI ZHOU (S.B. #251969)	
9	vzhou@omm.com BRIAN M. COOK (S.B. #266181)	
10	bcook@omm.com KEVIN MURRAY (S.B. #275186)	
11	kmurray2@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
12	400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, California 90071-2899	
13	Telephone: (213) 430-6000 Facsimile: (213) 430-6407	
14	[] J ~	
15	APPLE INC.	
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18	SAN JOSE	
19		
20	OpenTV, Inc., Nagravision, SA, and Nagra	Case No. 5:15-CV-02008-EJD
21	France S.A.S.,	DEFENDANT'S UNOPPOSED
22	Plaintiffs,	MOTION TO CHANGE DATE OF HEARING ON MOTION TO STAY
23	v.	PENDING COMPLETION OF USPTO PROCEEDINGS (CIVIL L.R. 6-3);
24	Apple Inc	SUPPORTING DECLARATION;
25	Apple Inc.,	[PROPOSED] ORDER
26	Defendant.	Judge: Honorable Edward J. Davila Courtroom: 4
27		
28		

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. 1

2

#### I. <u>UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CHANGE HEARING DATE ON MOTION TO STAY</u> <u>PENDING COMPLETION OF USPTO PROCEEDINGS (CIVIL L.R. 6-3)</u>

Defendant Apple Inc. respectfully makes this unopposed request to advance the hearing 3 date for Apple's Motion to Stay Pending Completion of USPTO Proceedings (Dkt. No. 92, the 4 "Motion to Stay").<sup>1</sup> In April and May of 2016, Apple filed petitions for *inter partes* review 5 ("IPR") or covered business method review ("CBM") before the United States Patent and 6 Trademark Office ("USPTO") for all remaining patents-in-suit. Apple then filed a Motion to Stay 7 this action pending completion of the USPTO proceedings.<sup>2</sup> Apple respectfully requests 8 advancing the hearing date for Apple's Motion to Stay from September 15, 2016 to June 9, 2016 9 (37 days after the Motion was filed). An earlier hearing date for the Motion to Stay has the 10 potential to conserve the Court's and the parties' time and resources, promote judicial economy, 11 and eliminate unnecessary litigation costs. 12 As explained in Apple's Motion to Stay, the pending reviews by the USPTO will likely 13

invalidate or alter the scope of the patents-in-suit.<sup>3</sup> Given the time-consuming and burdensome
claim construction, fact discovery, and expert discovery activities that the Court and parties must
undertake before September 15, Apple respectfully requests that the Court advance the hearing
date for Apple's Motion to Stay. By resolving the Motion to Stay earlier, the Court can avoid the
unnecessary expenditures of time and resources by the Court, Magistrate Judge Cousins, who has
been assigned to the case for discovery and scheduling issues, and the parties.

Significant work on this case is scheduled to be completed before the currently-scheduled hearing date for Apple's Motion to Stay. The Court is expected to issue a Claim Construction Order after the May 12, 2016 technology tutorial and claim construction hearing. Magistrate Judge Cousins is scheduled to hear a discovery dispute regarding compliance with the patent local

- <sup>2</sup> A few days before Apple's Tuesday, May 3, 2016 filing of the Motion to Stay, Apple's counsel emailed the Court's Deputy Clerk to reserve a hearing date, and was advised that the first available hearing date for the Motion was September 15, 2016.
- 28 <sup>3</sup> Further, Apple filed another petition for *inter partes* review on one of the three remaining patents-in-suit after the filing of the Motion to Stay. (*See* IPR2016-01004.)

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> <sup>1</sup> On March 2, 2016, counsel for Apple (Luann Simmons) conferred with counsel for Plaintiffs
 <sup>25</sup> (Robert McCauley), who confirmed that Plaintiffs do not oppose Apple's request to advance the hearing date.

#### Case 5:15-cv-02008-EJD Document 95 Filed 05/06/16 Page 3 of 6

1	rules on June 1, 2016. A trial setting conference and hearing on OpenTV's Motion for Rule 54(b)	
2	Certification are scheduled before this Court on July 21 and August 18, 2016, respectively. Fact	
3	discovery is ongoing, and the current case schedule requires the parties to serve expert reports on	
4	August 18 and September 15, 2016. (See Dkt. No. 58.) Thus, the Court and the parties are	
5	scheduled to expend significant resources over the next four months, most of which could be	
6	rendered unnecessary by an early resolution of Apple's Motion to Stay.	
7	II. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	
8	For the foregoing reasons, Apple respectfully requests that the Court advance the hearing	
9	date on Apple's Motion to Stay to June 9, 2016 (or as soon as permitted by the Court's schedule).	
10		
11	Dated: May 6, 2016 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP	
12		
13	By: <u>/s/ Luann L. Simmons</u>	
14	Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
DOCKET		
ALA	<b>R M</b> Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .	

	Case 5:15-cv-02008-EJD Document 95 Filed 05/06/16 Page 4 of 6	
1	SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF LUANN L. SIMMONS	
2	I, Luann L. Simmons, declare:	
3	1. I am a partner with the law firm of O'Melveny & Myers LLP, counsel for	
4	defendant Apple Inc. ("Apple") in the above-captioned litigation.	
5	2. I submit this declaration in support of Apple's Unopposed Motion to Change Date	
6	of Hearing on Motion to Stay Pending Completion of USPTO Proceedings (Civil L.R. 6-3). I	
7	have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called to testify as a	
8	witness, could and would do so competently.	
9	3. The factual statements included in the above Motion to advance the hearing date	
10	are true, including the fact that counsel for Plaintiffs advised that Plaintiffs do not oppose this	
11	motion to change time.	
12	4. The requested time modification will not affect any date set by the Court in this	
13	matter.	
14	5. The previous time modifications in this case made pursuant to the listed	
15	Stipulations, Court Orders, and Clerk's Notices are as follows:	
16	• Clerk's Notice of Impending Reassignment to a U.S. District Court Judge	
17	<ul> <li>vacating hearing dates scheduled before magistrate judge (Dkt. No. 16);</li> <li>Order of Recusal vacating all pending dates of motions, pretrial conferences</li> </ul>	
18	and trial (Dkt. No. 18);	
19	<ul> <li>Order assigning case to the Honorable Edward J. Davila vacating dates presently scheduled (Dkt. No. 19);</li> </ul>	
20	<ul> <li>Joint Stipulation to Extend Time for Apple Inc. to Respond to Complaint to June 26, 2015 (Dkt. No. 22);</li> </ul>	
21	Clerk's Notice Resetting Case Management Conference Following Reassignment from Magistrate Judge resetting due date for Case Management	
22	Statement to September 10, 2015, resetting Case Management Conference to	
23	September 17, 2015, and adjusting any deadlines associated with the Initial Case Management Conference accordingly (Dkt. No. 32);	
24	<ul> <li>Order (Dkt. No. 46) granting Joint Stipulation Regarding Briefing Schedule for Apple's Motion to Dismiss resetting the due date for OpenTV's opposition to</li> </ul>	
25	Apple's motion to July 17, 2015, and resetting Apple's reply to OpenTV's	
26	<ul><li>opposition to July 29, 2015 (Dkt. No. 44); and</li><li>ADR Phone Conference Re-Scheduling Notice resetting ADR Phone</li></ul>	
27	Conference to October 27, 2015 (Dkt. No. 56).	
28	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the	

**DOCKET A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>. 

1	foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 6th day of May, 2016, in San Francisco, California.		
2			
3			
4	/s/ Luann L. Simmons		
5	Luann L. Simmons		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
<b>DOCKET</b> <b>A L A R M</b> Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .			

## DOCKET A L A R M



# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## **Real-Time Litigation Alerts**



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## **Advanced Docket Research**



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## **Analytics At Your Fingertips**



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

#### LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

#### FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

### E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.