

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential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

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

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

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>