

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Inneos, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

Opticis Co., LTD, et al.,

Defendant.

Case No. 8:23-cv-00185-MCS-ADS

**SCHEDULING ORDER IN PATENT
CASES**

The Court has reviewed the parties' Joint Rule 26(f) Report. In addition to the dates and deadlines set in the concurrently filed Order Re: Jury Trial, the Court sets the following dates and deadlines:

///

Event	Date
Plaintiff's Deadline to Serve Infringement Contentions (PLR 3-1, 3-2)	July 18, 2023
Defendants' Deadline to Serve Invalidity Contentions (PLR 3-3, 3-4)	September 6, 2023
Deadline to Identify Claim Terms for Construction (PLR 4-1(a))	September 29, 2023
Deadline to Serve Damages Contentions (PLR 3-8)	October 18, 2023
Deadline to Exchange Claim Constructions (PLR 4-2(a), (b))	October 23, 2023
File Joint Claim Construction Prehearing Statement (PLR 4-3)	November 8, 2023
Deadline to Serve Responsive Damages Contentions (PLR 3-9)	November 17, 2023
Exchange Opening Claim Construction Briefs	December 15, 2023
Deadline to Complete Claim Construction Discovery	January 6, 2024
Exchange Responsive Claim Construction Briefs	January 12, 2024
Deadline for Defendants Reply Brief on any 112 Issues Raised	January 19, 2024
Claim Construction Hearing and Technology Tutorial	February 5, 2024 at 9:00 a.m.

If necessary, the Court will set further deadlines after the Claim Construction Hearing.

The parties' Joint Claim Construction Prehearing Statement shall contain a chart showing each party's proposed construction of each disputed term, together with an identification of all references from the specification or prosecution history that support that construction, and an identification of any extrinsic evidence supporting its proposed construction or undermining any other party's proposed construction, including, but not limited to, dictionary definitions, citations to learned treatises and prior art, and testimony of percipient and expert witnesses.

///

The parties shall identify up to ten (10) terms whose construction will be most significant to the case. If the parties cannot agree on the 10 most significant terms, the parties shall identify the ones they agree are most significant and then they may evenly divide the remainder. While the Court may in its discretion construe more than 10 terms, the total terms identified by all parties as most significant cannot exceed 10. For example, in a case involving two parties, if the parties agree upon the identification of five terms as most significant, each may only identify two additional terms as most significant. Failure to make a good faith effort to narrow the instances of disputed terms or otherwise participate in the meet and confer process may expose counsel to sanctions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1927.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 10, 2023

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Mark C. Scarsi". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

MARK C. SCARSI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE