

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2008-1462, -1463, -1464, -1465

TAURUS IP, LLC (now known as Manufacturing System Technologies, LLC),

Plaintiff/Third Party Defendant-
Appellant,

and

ORION IP, LLC (now known as Clear With Computers LLC)
And ERICH SPANGENBERG,

Third Party Defendant-Appellants,

v.

DAIMLERCHRYSLER CORPORATION, CHRYSLER FINANCIAL, LLC, and
DAIMLERCHRYSLER COMPANY, LLC,

Defendants-Appellees,

and

CHRYSLER HOLDING, LLC,

Defendant/Third Party Plaintiff-Appellee,

and

MERCEDES-BENZ USA, INC. and CHRYSLER LLC,

Defendants/Third Party Plaintiffs-Cross
Appellants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of
Wisconsin in case no. 07-CV-158, Chief Judge Barbara B. Crabb.

2008-1474, -1477

TAURUS IP, LLC (now known as Manufacturing System Technologies, LLC),

Defendant-Cross-Appellant,

v.

HYUNDAI MOTOR AMERICA,

Defendant-Cross Appellant,

and

REEBOK INTERNATIONAL, LTD.,

Defendant,

and

POLO RALPH LAUREN CORP.,

Defendant,

and

MICHELIN NORTH AMERICA, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin in case no. 07-CV-477, Chief Judge Barbara B. Crabb.

ON MOTION

Before PROST, Circuit Judge.

ORDER

Chrysler LLC and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC move for leave to submit documents for in camera review and to hold oral argument in camera. Orion IP, LLC and Erich Spangenberg oppose. Chrysler and Mercedes-Benz move without opposition for a 23-day extension of time, until January 9, 2009, to file the appellees' and cross-

appellants' opening briefs and to adopt a revised briefing schedule. Chrysler and Mercedes-Benz also move to deconsolidate the appeals into two separate companion cases.

Regarding the motion for leave to submit documents for in camera review, we deem it the better course to deny the motion at this time. The movants have not shown at this time that they should be permitted to include in their briefs any arguments or references to material that the other side may not read or respond to. If the merits panel chooses to review the documents in camera, the panel may request that the documents be provided by the district court or by one of the parties. The request to hold oral argument "in camera" is also denied without prejudice to requesting the relief from the merits panel, if appropriate.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The motion for leave to submit documents for in camera review is denied without prejudice to the merits panel asking for the documents for in camera review or otherwise. A copy of this order shall be provided to the merits panel assigned to hear this case to inform the panel regarding existence of the documents.

(2) The request to hold oral argument "in camera" is denied without prejudice to requesting the relief from the merits panel, if appropriate.

(3) The motion for an extension of time and to adopt a revised briefing schedule is granted. The appellants' response/reply briefs are due February 25, 2009. The cross-appellants' reply briefs are due March 12, 2009.

(4) The motion to deconsolidate the appeals is denied.

FOR THE COURT

FEB 9 2009

Date

/s/ Jan Horbaly
Jan Horbaly
Clerk

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

cc: Kenneth C. Bass, III, Esq.
Elizabeth A. Wiley, Esq.
Mitchell G. Stockwell, Esq.
Gene C. Schaerr, Esq.
Barry J. Schindler, Esq.

FEB 09 2009

**JAN HORBALY
CLERK**

s19