ORDER REQUIRING PARTIES TO

PROVIDE NOTICE RE. REASSIGNMENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE GREWAL

## For the Northern District of California

24

25

26

27

28

2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
8	Acer, Inc.,	NO. C 08-00877 JW NO. C 08-00882 JW
9	Plaintiff,	NO. C 08-00882 JW NO. C 08-05398 JW
10	v.	ORDER REQUIRING PA PROVIDE NOTICE RE. TO MAGISTRATE JUD
11	Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,	TO MAGISTRATE JUD
12	Defendants.	/
13	HTC Corp.,	
14	Plaintiff,	
15	V.	
16	Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,	
17	Defendants.	
18		_/
19	Barco NV, Plaintiff,	
20	v.	
21	Technology Properties Ltd, et al.,	
22	Defendants.	1
23		

On June 12, 2012, the Court issued its First Claim Construction Order in the above-captioned matters. (See Docket Item No. 336 in No. C 08-00877 JW.) In that Order, the Court informed the parties that, in light of its impending retirement, it proposed to assign this case to Magistrate Judge Grewal. (Id. at 22.) The Court instructed the parties to state "whether they jointly consent to having this case immediately reassigned to Judge Grewal," and informed them that, in the event they do not

jointly consent to the immediate reassignment, "the case will remain with Judge Ware and be subject
to reassignment in due course." ( <u>Id.</u> )
On July 2, 2012, the parties filed a Joint Statement in response to the Court's First Claim

On July 2, 2012, the parties filed a Joint Statement in response to the Court's First Claim Construction Order. (See Docket Item No. 337 in No. C 08-00877 JW.) In that Joint Statement, the parties stated that "[a]t this time, not all parties have agreed to consent to Magistrate Judge Grewal for further proceedings." (Id. at 3.) In particular, the Joint Statement informed the Court that "Barco and HTC have not yet made a final determination but expect to have a decision soon." (Id.) However, the parties have not filed any subsequent statement informing the Court whether Barco and HTC have agreed to consent to having this case reassigned to Judge Grewal.

Accordingly, and in order to resolve this issue prior to the Court's retirement, the parties shall file a Joint Statement on or before August 6, 2012 indicating whether all parties consent to having this case immediately reassigned to Judge Grewal. If all parties have not consented to the reassignment to Judge Grewal by that date, the case will remain with Judge Ware and will be subject to reassignment in due course.

Dated: August 2, 2012 

United States District Chief Judge

## THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO: 1 Deepak Gupta dgupta@fbm.com Eugene Y. Mar emar@fbm.com 3 Harold H. Davis harold.davis@klgates.com James Carl Otteson jim@agilityiplaw.com Jas S Dhillon jas.dhillon@klgates.com 4 Jeffrey M. Fisher jfisher@fbm.com 5 Jeffrey Michael Ratinoff jeffrey.ratinoff@klgates.com John L. Cooper jcooper@fbm.com Kyle Dakai Chen kyle.chen@cooley.com 6 Mark R. Weinstein mweinstein@coolev.com 7 Michelle Gail Breit mbreit@agilityiplaw.com Nan E. Joesten njoesten@fbm.com 8 Paul A. Alsdorf palsdorf@fbm.com Samuel Citron O'Rourke eupton@whitecase.com 9 Stephanie Powers Skaff sskaff@fbm.com Timothy Paar Walker timothy.walker@klgates.com William Sloan Coats william.coats@kayescholer.com 10 11 Dated: August 2, 2012 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk 12 13 /s/ JW Chambers By:\_ William Noble 14 **Courtroom Deputy** 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28