

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

---

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No.: 2:12-cv-02834-JPM-tmp
	)	
MATCH.COM LLC,	)	
	)	
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. 41), filed March 18, 2013. B.E. Technology seeks oral argument regarding Defendant Match.com LLC’s (“Defendant” or “Match.com”) Motion to Change Venue (ECF No. 32), filed February 5, 2013. Plaintiff filed its Response in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion (ECF No. 37) on February 22, 2013. With leave of Court, Defendant filed its Reply (ECF No. 40) on March 11, 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 [Match.com’s] reply memoranda,” and “provide the Court a forum to ask any questions it may have before deciding these important issues.” (ECF No. 41 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