1	JONES HELSLEY PC 8365 N. Fresno Street, Suite 310		
2	Post Office Box 28340 Fresno, California 93729		
3	Telephone: (559) 233-4800 Facsimile: (559) 233-9330		
4	Taesinine. (337) 233-7330		
5	Timothy Jones #119841 John P. Kinsey #215916		
6	John 1. Kinsey #213510		
7	Attorneys for: Plaintiffs Rocky Mountain Farm And Soybeans Growers: Penny	ners Union; Redwood County Minnesota Corn Newman Grain, Inc.; Fresno County Farm	
8	Bureau; Nisei Farmers League; Growth Energy and the Renewa	California Dairy Campaign; Rex Nederend;	
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	EASTERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	ROCKY MOUNTAIN FARMERS UNION; <i>et al.</i> ,	Case No. 1:09-CV-02234-LJO-DLB	
13	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO	
14	v.	FURTHER CONTINUE MANDATORY SCHEDULING	
15	JAMES N. GOLDSTENE,	CONFERENCE	
16	Defendant.		
17			
18	NATIONAL PETROCHEMICAL & REFINERS ASSOCIATION, et al.,	Related with Case No.: 1:10-CV-00163-LJO-DLB	
19 20	Plaintiffs,		
20 21	v.		
21	JAMES GOLDSTENE, et al.,		
22	Defendants		
23 24	And related intervenor actions		
25			
26	///		
27	///		
28	///		
	{7011/005/00252404.DOC} 1		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO FURTHER CONTINUE MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE		

WHEREAS the Mandatory Scheduling Conferences scheduled in the related
 actions of *Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, et al. v. Goldstene*, Case No. 1:09-CV-02234-LJO DLB (the "RMFU Action"), and *National Petrochemical & Refiners Association, et al. v. Goldstene, et al.*, Case No. 1:10-CV-00163-LJO-DLB (the "NPRA Action") are presently set
 for July 28, 2010, in Courtroom No. 9, at 9:00 a.m. and 9:15 a.m.

6 WHEREAS the Defendants in the RMFU Action and the NPRA Action recently
7 filed their Answers on July 14, 2010.

8 WHEREAS both the Plaintiffs in RMFU and NPRA Actions and Defendants 9 have agreed to stipulate to continue the Mandatory Scheduling Conferences in the above 10 actions, to provide the parties additional time to meet and confer regarding their Joint 11 Scheduling Conference Statements.

WHEREAS additional time to meet and confer regarding the Joint Scheduling
 Conference Statements is necessary to allow the parties to further discuss which facts and/or
 legal issues in the above actions are disputed or undisputed.

WHEREAS all parties are available to conduct the Mandatory Scheduling
Conferences in these actions on September 9, 2010, and have agreed to hold it on this date,
pending approval by the Court.

**IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED**, by and between Plaintiffs in both actions and
 Defendants, by and through their respective counsel, that:

1. The Mandatory Scheduling Conferences in the above-captioned actions,
 previously scheduled for July 28, 2010, should be continued to September 9, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.,
 or such time as may be set by the Court, in Courtroom 9 (6th Floor).

23 2. The parties shall serve their initial disclosures under Rule 26 of the
24 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure no later than 14 days following the September 9, 2010,
25 Mandatory Scheduling Conferences.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

{7011/005/00252404.DOC}

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO FURTHER CONTINUE MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE

2

1 2	Dated: July 16, 2010STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	By: <u>/s/ Mark Poole</u> Mark Poole, Attorneys for All Defendants SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP By: <u>/s/ Marie C. Fiala</u> Marie C. Fiala, Attorneys for the NPRA Plaintiffs	
9 10 11	Dated: July 22, 2010 JONES HELSLEY PC	
12 13 14 15	By: <u>/s/ John P. Kinsey</u> John P. Kinsey, Attorneys for the RMFU Plaintiffs	
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ol>	ORDER         The Court having reviewed the foregoing Stipulation, and good cause appearing therefor:         IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Mandatory Scheduling Conferences in the above-captioned actions, previously scheduled for July 28, 2010, shall be continued to September 9, 2010, at 9:00 a.m. in Courtroom 9 (6th Floor).         IT IS ALSO ORDERED that the parties shall serve their initial disclosures under Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure no later than 14 days following the September 9, 2010, Mandatory Scheduling Conferences.         IT IS SO ORDERED.         IT IS SO ORDERED.         IT IS SO ORDERED.         UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
	{7011/005/00252404.DOC} 3 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO FURTHER CONTINUE MANDATORY SCHEDULING CONFERENCE	