

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE**

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No.: 2:12-cv-02782-JPM-cgc
)	
PANDORA MEDIA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Before the Court is Plaintiff B.E. Technology, LLC’s (“B.E. Technology”) Motion for Oral Argument (ECF No. 38), filed March 18, 2013. B.E. Technology seeks oral argument regarding Defendant Pandora Media, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Pandora”) Motion to Change Venue (ECF No. 19), filed December 26, 2012. Plaintiff filed its Response in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion (ECF No. 27) on January 14, 2013. With leave of Court, Defendant filed its Reply (ECF No. 33) on February 1, 2013.

B.E. Technology asserts that an oral hearing on the Motion to Change Venue will “enable [Plaintiff] adequately to respond to the arguments and evidence presented by [Pandora’s] reply memoranda,” and “provide the Court a forum to ask any questions it may have before deciding these important issues.” (ECF No. 38 at 1–2.) Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 1.2 and Local Rule 7.2(d), the Court finds that a hearing is not necessary. Plaintiff’s Motion is, therefore, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of April, 2013.

/s/ Jon P. McCalla
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE