

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

---

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No.: 2:12-cv-02831-JPM-tmp
	)	
APPLE 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. 43), filed March 18, 2013. B.E. Technology seeks oral argument regarding Defendant Apple Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Apple”) Motion to Change Venue (ECF No. 22), filed December 20, 2012. Plaintiff filed its Response in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion (ECF No. 30) on January 7, 2013. With leave of Court, Defendant filed its Reply (ECF No. 39) on January 29, 2013.

B.E. Technology asserts that an oral hearing on the Motion will “enable [Plaintiff] adequately to respond to the arguments and evidence presented by [Apple’s] reply memoranda,” and “provide the Court a forum to ask any questions it may have before deciding these important issues.” (ECF No. 43 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