UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Tesla, Inc. v. Proception, Inc.

No. 25-cv-04963-SVK, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (June 26, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California sets a briefing schedule for Tesla's motion for expedited discovery and suspends briefing on Tesla's motion for a preliminary injunction pending resolution of the discovery motion. The Court grants in part and denies in part Tesla's motion for leave to file a reply concerning its motion to shorten time, and sets opposition, reply, and hearing dates.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan Van Keulen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 26, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-04963-SVK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Tesla moved for a preliminary injunction, expedited discovery, and shortened time for briefing on the expedited-discovery motion. Tesla also moved for leave to file a reply concerning the motion to shorten time.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised its discretion to manage briefing schedules and motion practice, considering judicial efficiency, fairness, and potential prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Tesla, Inc. v. Proception, Inc., Zhongji Jay Li

TOPICS

discovery dispute | injunctions | civil procedure | commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure | Commercial litigation | Trade secrets

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether briefing on Tesla's preliminary-injunction motion should be suspended pending resolution of the motion for expedited discovery.
2. Whether Tesla should receive leave to file a reply in support of its motion to shorten time, and if so, what portions of the proposed reply should be considered.
3. Whether the court should shorten the briefing and argument schedule for Tesla's motion for expedited discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. Briefing on Tesla's preliminary-injunction motion was suspended pending resolution of the motion for expedited discovery or further order of the court.
2. Tesla's motion for leave to file a reply was granted in part and denied in part: the court accepted and considered only the portion addressing facts omitted from defendants' opposition and did not accept the portion seeking to distinguish allegedly inapposite case law.
3. The court granted the request to shorten time and set defendants' opposition for June 30, 2025 at noon, Tesla's reply for July 2, 2025 at noon, and the hearing for July 3, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. by remote videoconference.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"The district court has considerable latitude in managing the parties' motion practice..."* (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tesla alleged claims against Proception, Inc. and Zhongji Jay Li and sought a preliminary injunction and expedited discovery. Tesla requested that the briefing period for expedited discovery be shortened by one day for defendants and by five days for Tesla's reply. The court determined that discovery responses would not assist resolution of the preliminary-injunction motion before the existing reply deadline and therefore suspended briefing on that motion pending resolution of the expedited-discovery request.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending before the Northern District of California on Tesla's motions. The court suspended briefing on the preliminary-injunction motion, granted in part and denied in part Tesla's motion for leave to file a reply, and set an expedited briefing and hearing schedule for the motion for expedited discovery.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hiramanek v. Clark, No. 13-cv-00228-RMW, 2016 WL 11033962, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2016)

OPINION

Tesla, Inc. v. Proception, Inc.
PER CURIAM.
1 2 3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6 7 TESLA, INC., Case No. 25-cv-04963-SVK 8 Plaintiff,
ORDER SETTING BRIEFING
9 v. SCHEDULE
10 PROCEPTION, INC., et al., Re: Dkt. Nos. 14, 15, 16, 32 11 Defendants. 12 Before the Court are several motions filed by Plaintiff Tesla, Inc. ("Tesla"): a Motion for 13 Preliminary Injunction, (Dkt. 14, "PI Motion"); a Motion for Expedited Discovery, (Dkt. 15); 14 and an Administrative Motion to Shorten Time for Plaintiff's Motion for Expedited Discovery, 15 (Dkt. 16, "Motion to Shorten time"). Defendants Proception, Inc. and Zhongji Jay Li 16 (collectively, "Defendants") have opposed the Motion to Shorten Time, (Dkt. 30), and Tesla has 17 filed an Administrative Motion for Leave to File a Reply as to the Motion to Shorten Time, (Dkt. 18 32). With these motions pending, and having considered the Parties' submissions and the relevant 19 law, the Court sets the following briefing schedule and ORDERS as follows: 20 • PI Motion: The Court agrees with Defendants that, even on an expedited 21 schedule, discovery responses would not be due until after the deadline for Tesla's 22 reply and thus would be of no aid to this Court. To further the interests of judicial 23 efficiency, and to allow sufficient time for the Parties and the Court to address the 24 motion for expedited discovery and, if granted, the fruits of discovery, the Court 25 suspends briefing of the PI Motion pending resolution of the Motion for 26 Expedited Discovery or further order of this Court. 27 • Administrative Motion for Leave: "Unless otherwise ordered, a Motion for] hearing on the day after the opposition is due." Civ. L.R. 7-11(c). Ordinarily, no 2 reply is provided for. See id. In the analogous sur-reply context, this District 3 permits supplementary material only when a new and relevant judicial opinion is 4 published or when responding to new evidence. Civ. L.R. 7-3(d). Tesla's 5 proffered reply seeks to: (1) distinguish assertedly "inapposite case law" cited by 6 Defendants and (2) present, for context, facts omitted from the opposition. Dkt. 7 32. at 2. Guided by the Local Rules, this Court will accept and consider only the g latter part of Tesla's proffered reply (Dkt. 32-1, § II(b) and Dkt. 32-3). Tesla's 9 Motion for Leave is thus GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. 10 e Motion to Shorten Time and Briefing for Expedited Discovery: "The district 11 court has considerable latitude in managing the parties' motion practice..." zs 12 Hiramanek v. Clark, No. 13-cv-00228-RMW, 2016 WL 11033962, at *1 (N.D. E 13 Cal. Mar. 29, 2016). Contrary to Defendants' position, the Court does not agree 14 that shortening the time for briefing and argument of the

Motion for Expedited 3 15 Discovery will prejudice Defendants. Contra Dkt. 30 at 8. Tesla has sought to 16 shorten the period for Defendants to respond to the Motion for Expedited 5 17 discovery by only one day and shortens its own reply period by five days. See 5 18 Dkt. 16-3 at 2. In the interests of judicial efficiency and fairness the Parties, the 19 Court sets the following schedule for the Motion for Expedited Discovery: 20 o Defendants' Opposition due: June 30, 2025 by 12:00pm Noon. 1 o Tesla's Reply due: July 2, 2025 by 12:00pm Noon. 2 o Hearing: July 3, 2025 at 9:30am via remote videoconference. 23 04 SO ORDERED. 5 Dated: June 26, 2025 26 Stem veYul

SUSAN VAN KEULEN

28 United States Magistrate Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/tesla-inc-v-proception-inc-b5yn2hn4