

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

(COUNSEL LISTED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PERFECT 10, INC., a California corporation,

*Plaintiff,*

vs.

GOOGLE INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

*Defendants.*

CASE NO. CV 04-9484 AHM (SHx)

**STIPULATION FOR STAY OF DISCOVERY AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS PENDING RULING BY COURT OF APPEALS**

Court: Hon. A. Howard Matz

[Proposed] Order Filed Concurrently Herewith

AND COUNTERCLAIM

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
Michael T. Zeller (Bar No. 196417)  
2 michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com  
865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
3 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
4 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100  
Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151)  
5 charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
6 San Francisco, California 94111  
Rachel Herrick Kassabian (Bar No. 191060)  
7 rachelkassabian@quinnemanuel.com  
Margret M. Caruso (Bar No. 243473)  
8 margretcaruso@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
9 Redwood Shores, California 94065

10 Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.

11

12 THE LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY N. MAUSNER  
Jeffrey N. Mausner (State Bar No. 122385)  
13 David N. Schultz (State Bar No. 123094)  
Warner Center Towers  
14 21800 Oxnard Street, Suite 910  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
15 Telephone: 818-992-7500  
Facsimile: 818-716-2773

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff Perfect 10, Inc.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1           WHEREAS, this Court, by its July 30, 2010 Order denied plaintiff Perfect 10,  
2 Inc.'s second motion for preliminary injunction against defendant Google Inc., which  
3 incorporates by reference the Court's July 26, 2010 Order on Google's DMCA  
4 Motions;

5           WHEREAS, on August 20, 2010 Perfect 10 confirmed to Google that it would  
6 file an appeal of the Court's orders;

7           WHEREAS, Perfect 10's planned appeal of the Court's rulings on Perfect 10's  
8 preliminary injunction motion and Google's DMCA motions will address important,  
9 foundational legal issues in the case;

10           WHEREAS, it is in the best interests of judicial economy to stay discovery,  
11 motion practice, and all other proceedings in the District Court in the above-  
12 captioned action, except for those matters directly related to the appeal, until the  
13 Ninth Circuit rules on Perfect 10's appeal to determine the governing legal standards  
14 and what further discovery and motion practice, if any, will be necessary to resolve  
15 Perfect 10's claims;

16           WHEREAS, Magistrate Judge Hillman issued his Order re Google's Motion to  
17 Quash the Subpoenas Directed to Shantal Rands Poovala and for a Protective Order,  
18 which Order was electronically served upon the parties on August 10, 2010 (Docket  
19 No. 964);

20           WHEREAS, under L.R. 72-2.1, the time for Google to file a motion for review  
21 of Magistrate Judge Hillman's Order is no later than August 24, 2010;

22           WHEREAS, on August 18, 2010, Google informed Perfect 10 that it intends to  
23 file objections to and a motion for review of Magistrate Judge Hillman's Order, based  
24 in part on this Court's rulings on Perfect 10's preliminary injunction motion and  
25 Google's DMCA motions;

26           WHEREAS, the parties have mutually agreed to extend the deadline pertaining  
27 to Google's objections and motion for review of Magistrate Judge Hillman's Order  
28



1 DATED: August 23, 2010

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN. LLP

2

3

By



4

Margret Caruso  
Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.

5

6

7 DATED: August 23, 2010

THE LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY N.  
MAUSNER

8

9

By /s/ (with permission)

10

Jeffrey N. Mausner  
Attorney for Plaintiff PERFECT 10. INC.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28