

[Maurice Mitchell Innovations, L.P. v. Intel Corp.](#)

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

November 5, 2007, Decided; November 5, 2007, Filed

2007-1108

Reporter

2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 26825

MAURICE MITCHELL INNOVATIONS, L.P.,
Plaintiff-Appellant, v. INTEL CORPORATION,
Defendant-Appellee.

Notice: THIS DECISION WAS ISSUED AS UNPUBLISHED OR NONPRECEDENTIAL AND MAY NOT BE CITED AS PRECEDENT. PLEASE REFER TO FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE RULE 32.1 GOVERNING THE CITATION TO UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS.

Prior History: [Maurice Mitchell Innovations, L.P. v. Intel Corp.](#), 249 Fed. Appx. 184, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 22694 (Fed. Cir., 2007)

Core Terms

petition for rehearing, en banc, circuit judge

Counsel: [*1] For Intel Corporation, Defendant-Appellee: VAN NEST, ROBERT A., PRINCIPAL ATTORNEY, HIRSCH, STEVEN ARTHUR, ANDERSON, CHRISTAM., OF COUNSEL ATTORNEY, Kecker & Van Nest, LLP, San Francisco, CA.

For Maurice Mitchell Innovations, L.P., Plaintiff-Appellant: SCHWARTZ, RICHARD L., PRINCIPAL ATTORNEY, Whitaker, Chalk, Swindle & Sawyer, Fort Worth, TX; POKOTILOW, MANNY D., OF

COUNSEL ATTORNEY, Caesar, Rivise, Bernstein, Cohen, Philadelphia, PA.

Judges: Circuit Judge Schall did not participate in the vote.

Opinion

ORDER

A combined petition for panel rehearing and for rehearing en banc having been filed by the Appellant, and the petition for rehearing, having been referred to the panel that heard the appeal, and thereafter the petition for rehearing en banc having been referred to the circuit judges who are in regular active service,

UPON CONSIDERATION THEREOF, it is

ORDERED that the petition for panel rehearing be, and the same hereby is, DENIED and it is further

ORDERED that the petition for rehearing en banc be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

The mandate of the court will issue on November 13, 2007.

Circuit Judge Schall did not participate in the vote.