

ATTACHMENT A
PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 18-303-RGA
)	
HOSPIRA, INC. and ORION CORP.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

[PROPOSED] SCHEDULING ORDER

This ___ day of _____, 2018, the Court having conducted an initial Rule 16(b) scheduling conference pursuant to Local Rules 16.1(b), and the parties having determined after discussion that the matter cannot be resolved at this juncture by settlement, voluntary mediation, or binding arbitration;

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures. The parties shall make their initial disclosures pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) within fourteen days of this Order, by **May 24, 2018.**

2. Initial Disclosures and Initial Discovery in Patent Litigation.

a. On or before **June 11, 2018**, the parties shall make their initial disclosures pursuant to Section 3 of the Court’s Default Standard for Discovery.

b. On or before **June 11, 2018**, Hospira, Inc. and Orion Corp. (collectively, “Defendants”) shall specifically identify Baxter Healthcare Corporation’s (“Plaintiff”) accused products and the asserted patents they allegedly infringe, and produce the file history for each asserted patent.

c. On or before **July 11, 2018**, Plaintiff shall produce to Defendants the core technical documents related to the accused products, including but not limited to operation manuals, product literature, schematics, and specifications.

d. On or before **August 10, 2018**, Defendants shall produce to Plaintiff initial claim charts relating the accused products to the asserted claims that the products alleged infringe. The initial claim charts shall identify specifically where each element of each asserted claim is found within the accused products, including for each element that such party contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or material(s) in the accused products that perform the claimed function, and shall also state whether each element of each asserted claim is alleged to be present in the accused products literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

3. Joinder of Other Parties and Amendment of Pleadings. All motions to join other parties, and to amend or supplement the pleadings, shall be filed on or before **January 5, 2019**.

4. Discovery.

a. Fact Discovery Cut Off. All fact discovery in this case shall be initiated so that it will be completed on or before [**Baxter proposal: November 15, 2018**] [**Hospira/Orion proposal: April 15, 2019**].

b. Document Production. Document production shall be substantially complete by [**Baxter proposal: August 31, 2018**] [**Hospira/Orion proposal: February 15, 2019**].

c. On-Site Inspection of Electronic Media. Such an inspection shall not be permitted absent a demonstration by the requesting party of specific need and good cause.

d. Electronically Stored Information (ESI). If the producing party elects to use search terms to locate potentially responsive ESI, it shall disclose the search terms to the

requesting party on or before **July 15, 2018**. Absent a showing of good cause, a requesting party may request no more than 10 additional terms to be used in connection with the electronic search. Focused terms, rather than over-broad terms (e.g., product and company names) shall be employed. The producing party shall search (i) the non-custodial data sources identified in accordance with paragraph 3(b) of the Court's Default Standard for Discovery; and (ii) emails and other ESI maintained by the custodians identified in accordance with paragraph 3(a) of the Court's Default Standard for Discovery.

e. Requests for Admission. A maximum of **50** requests for admission are permitted for each side. In addition, the parties may serve a reasonable number of requests for admission to establish the authenticity of document. Requests for admission directed to document authentication shall be clearly denoted as such, and shall be served separately from requests for admission subject to the numerical limitations stated above. The parties will work to agree on authentication where possible.

f. Interrogatories. A maximum of **25** interrogatories, including contention interrogatories, are permitted for each side.

g. Depositions.

i. Limitation on Hours for Deposition Discovery. For all deposition discovery other than expert deposition discovery, each side is limited to a total of 10 depositions and 70 hours of taking testimony by deposition upon oral examination. Further, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the maximum number of deposition hours permitted for any particular person (other than experts) shall be 7 hours, regardless of whether that person is testifying in his individual capacity, as a Rule 30(b)(6) designee, or some combination thereof. For expert deposition discovery, each side shall be entitled to a separate deposition each Rule 26(a)(2)(B)

report submitted by an expert. The parties shall discuss any further limitations on these expert depositions after service of expert reply reports. If a party believes that additional hours for deposition discovery are necessary, the parties shall meet and confer and try to reach agreement on the amount of additional hours needed, and thereafter, if unable to reach agreement, the parties may seek modification of this provision by submission to the Court.

ii. Location of Depositions. The parties shall meet and confer regarding the locations of depositions, taking into account convenience for the deponent.

h. Discovery Matters and Disputes Relating to Protective Orders. Should counsel find they are unable to resolve a discovery matter or a dispute relating to a protective order, the parties involved in the discovery matter or protective order dispute shall contact the Court's Case Manager to schedule an in-person conference/argument. Unless otherwise ordered, by no later than forty-eight hours prior to the conference/argument, the party seeking relief shall file with the Court a letter, not to exceed three pages, outlining the issues in dispute and its position on those issues. By no later than twenty-four hours prior to the conference/argument, any party opposing the application for relief may file a letter, not to exceed three pages, outlining that party's reasons for its opposition. Should any document(s) be filed under seal, a courtesy copy of the sealed document(s) must be provided to the Court within one hour of e-filing the document(s).

If a discovery-related motion is filed without leave of the Court, it will be denied without prejudice to the moving party's right to bring the dispute to the Court through the discovery matters procedures set forth in this Order.

5. Application to Court for Protective Order. Counsel will confer and attempt to reach an agreement on a proposed form of protective order specifying terms and conditions for

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.