

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

APPLE, INC., a California corporation,)	Case No.: 11-CV-01846-LHK
)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
)	ENLARGE PAGE LIMIT
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., A)	
Korean corporation; SAMSUNG)	
ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC., a New York)	
corporation; SAMSUNG)	
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC,)	
a Delaware limited liability company,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On August 28, 2012, after extended discussion with the parties, this Court issued a carefully considered Order setting a briefing schedule and page limits for all of the post-trial briefing in this case (“Scheduling Order”). ECF No. 1945. In the Scheduling Order, the Court limited the briefing for Apple’s motion for permanent injunction and willfulness enhancements to 30 pages for the opening brief, 35 pages for Samsung’s opposition, and 15 pages for Apple’s reply. On October 26, 2012, after Samsung filed its opposition, Apple filed a motion to enlarge the page limit for its reply in support of motion for permanent injunction and enhanced damages. ECF No. 2092. Samsung filed an opposition to that motion to enlarge the page limit. ECF No. 2098. Apple then filed a motion for leave to file a reply, ECF No. 2099, to which Samsung filed a separate opposition. ECF Nos. 2101. The Court DENIES Apple’s motion to enlarge pages, and accordingly DENIES as moot Apple’s motion to file a reply.

1 Apple's stated grounds for asking this Court to change its well considered allotment of
2 pages after two of the three briefs have already been submitted are: (1) that in its opposition,
3 Samsung submitted substantial additional evidence and arguments not presented at trial; and (2)
4 that in its opposition, Samsung refers to analysis in the Federal Circuit's October 11, 2012 opinion
5 in Case No. 12-CV-00630. Neither argument would justify altering the established page limits at
6 this late stage.

7 As Samsung points out, the parties were aware before the briefing even began that
8 additional evidence would be necessary for the preliminary injunction. *See* 8/24/2012 Tr. at
9 4323:15-18 (counsel for Apple noting that "we're going to be assembling the record that's already
10 been adduced at trial and adding to it additional evidence on irreparable harm. . ."). The fact that
11 both Apple and Samsung discussed additional evidence in their briefs does not now justify giving
12 Apple additional pages.

13 Further, the arguments addressed in the Federal Circuit opinion were well known to the
14 parties far in advance of the present briefing deadlines in this case. Apple had the opportunity to
15 address the issues it knew were under consideration in its brief, and Apple now has the opportunity
16 to respond to Samsung's discussion of the opinion within the existing boundaries of its reply brief.
17 It would not be fair to change the allotments now, after Samsung has already filed its opposition.
18 Accordingly, Apple's motion to enlarge the page limit is DENIED.

19 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: October 29, 2012

21 
22 LUCY H. KOH
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28