

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

No. C 10-03561 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

**ORDER RE FOLLOW UP FROM
HEARING ON AUGUST 17, 2016**

Defendant.

By **THURSDAY AUGUST 25, AT NOON**, Christa Anderson, counsel for Google, shall submit a sworn statement explaining why the discovery responses referenced in Court yesterday were not updated, including the full extent to which counsel knew Google’s intention to launch a full version of Marshmallow, including the Google Play Store, for Chrome OS.


By the same date and time, Annette Hurst, counsel for Oracle, shall submit a sworn statement setting forth, after full inquiry, the full extent to which Oracle neglected to update its discovery responses by reason, in whole or in part, of one or more rulings by the judge. The same statement shall explain why counsel repeatedly represented that the *Jones v. Aero/chem* decision required an “evidentiary hearing” when that decision, as it turns out, made no mention of an “evidentiary hearing” and instead remanded because no “hearing” or other consideration at all had been given to the issue of discovery conduct by the district judge.

By the same date, counsel shall meet and confer and advise the Court whether the form of judgment should be amended to reflect that it is not a final judgment but a Rule 52(c)

1 judgment on partial findings, given that Oracle is entitled to challenge further uses of Android
2 herein.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: August 18, 2016.


7 _____
8 WILLIAM ALSUP
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28