

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

SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN &
 ARNOLD LLP
 BRUCE D. CELEBREZZE Bar No. 102181
 MARK J. HANCOCK Bar No. 160662
 ANDREW J. KING Bar No. 253962
 bruce.celebrezze@sdma.com
 mark.hancock@sdma.com
 andrew.king@sdma.com
 One Market Plaza
 Steuart Tower, 8th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94105
 Telephone: (415) 781-7900
 Facsimile: (415) 781-2635

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE
 COMPANY

LAW OFFICES OF JOHN C. KIEHLMEIER
 JOHN C. KIEHLMEIER Bar No. 124083
 P.O. Box 1144
 Corona del Mar, California 92625
 Telephone: (949) 274-4614

PETRIE, DORFMEIER & MORRIS, LLP
 SEAN T. O'ROURKE, Bar No. 199420
 2014 Tulare Street, Suite 830
 Fresno, CA 93721
 Telephone: (559) 498-6522
 Facsimile: (559) 498-6516

Attorneys for Defendants
 TECH LOGISTICS CORPORATION, d/b/a
 SYSTEMS LOGISTICS SERVICES and
 d/b/a SYSTEMS LOGISTICS; AGRI-
 COMM EXPRESS, INC.; TRUCKING
 EQUIPMENT COMPANY, INC.; ELISEO
 ONTIVEROS VALDEZ.

WILKINS, DROLSHAGEN &
 CZESHINSKI LLP
 JAMES H. WILKINS Bar No. 116364
 6785 N. Willow Ave.
 Fresno, CA 93710
 Telephone: (559) 438-2390
 Facsimile: (559) 438-2393

Attorneys for Defendants CONCEPCION
 GARCIA, and QUETZAL GARCIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE
 COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

 TECH LOGISTICS CORPORATION,
 d/b/a SYSTEMS LOGISTICS SERVICES
 and d/b/a SYSTEMS LOGISTICS, a Texas
 Corporation; AGRI-COMM EXPRESS,
 INC., a California Corporation;
 TRUCKING EQUIPMENT COMPANY,
 INC., a Wisconsin Corporation; ELISEO
 ONTIVEROS VALDEZ, an individual;
 CONCEPCION GARCIA, an individual;
 and QUETZAL GARCIA, a minor child,

 Defendants.

 And Related Counterclaim.

CASE NO. 1:10-CV-00520-AWI-MJS

**STIPULATION AND ORDER RE:
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY AND
 REVISED CASE SCHEDULE**

(ECF NOS. 35 & 36)

JUDGE: Hon. Anthony W. Ishii
 MAG. JUDGE: Hon. Michael J. Seng

1 TO THE COURT, AND ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:
2 THIS STIPULATION is entered into by and between plaintiff, ACE American Insurance
3 Company (“Plaintiff”), and defendants Tech Logistics Corporation, d/b/a Systems Logistics
4 Services and d/b/a Systems Logistics, a Texas Corporation; Agri-Comm Express, Inc., a
5 California Corporation; Trucking Equipment Company, Inc., a Wisconsin Corporation; Eliseo
6 Ontiveros Valdez, an individual, Concepcion Garcia, an individual; and Quetzal Garcia, a minor
7 child, (“Defendants”), collectively referred to herein as the “Parties,” by and through their
8 attorneys of record and pursuant to Civil Local Rule 143.

9 WHEREAS, on September 10, 2010, counsel for defendants Tech Logistics Corporation
10 (“TLC”), Trucking Equipment Company, Inc. (“TEC”), Agri-Comm Express, Inc., and Eliseo
11 Valdez (collectively “the TLC defendants”) informed counsel for Plaintiff, for the first time, that
12 TLC and TEC were not in good standing in the State of California.

13 WHEREAS, on September 22, 2010, the TLC defendants filed an ex parte motion to
14 modify the case scheduling order and for a stay of discovery to allow for corporate revivor.

15 WHEREAS, in their motion, the TLC defendants sought a stay of all discovery, and a
16 continuance of all dates on the case schedule, including the trial itself, in order to allow TLC (but
17 not TEC) time to seek to revive its corporate status from the current “suspended” state.

18 WHEREAS, on September 27, 2010, Plaintiff filed its opposition to the motion, and
19 argued that the relief sought by TLC was overbroad and that the only changes which should be
20 made to the case schedule were those necessary to protect Plaintiff’s interests as a result of
21 TLC’s failure to remain in good standing with the Secretary of State.

22 WHEREAS, the Court held a hearing on defendants’ motion on October 1, 2010 and
23 continued the hearing to October 8, 2010.

24 WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the October 8, 2010 hearing, the Court ordered a 60-day
25 stay of all proceedings in order for TLC to complete its corporate revivor in California.

26 WHEREAS, the 60-day stay of all proceedings went into effect on October 8, 2010 and
27 will end on December 7, 2010.

1 WHEREAS, at the October 8, 2010 hearing, the Court directed counsel for the Parties to
2 stipulate to a new case schedule within 10 days.

3 WHEREAS, the Parties, through their respective counsel, have met and conferred and
4 have agreed to a revised case schedule as set forth below.

5 WHEREAS, the parties agree that Plaintiff should not suffer prejudice as a result of the
6 stay ordered by the court on October 8, 2010. To this end, the parties agree that the court should
7 order that: (1) nothing in this stipulation will preclude Plaintiff from seeking such further
8 scheduling relief as may be necessary in this case, including, for example, as a result of
9 discovery issues that arose prior to the stay, or which may arise going forward; and (2) Plaintiff
10 will not be precluded, due, for example, to the passage of time, from introducing any evidence or
11 argument at a postponed trial that Plaintiff would otherwise have been entitled to introduce at a
12 trial held on July 12, 2011.

13 NOW, THEREFORE, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 143, the Parties jointly request and
14 HEREBY STIPULATE that the case schedule shall be revised as follows:

Event	Original Date	Revised Date
Deadline for seeking leave to amend pleadings	October 1, 2010	December 17, 2010
Non-expert discovery cutoff	November 1, 2010	January 7, 2011
Expert witness disclosure deadline	October 22, 2010	January 14, 2011
Supp. expert witness disclosure deadline	November 5, 2010	January 28, 2011
Expert witness discovery cutoff	December 6, 2010	February 28, 2011
Deadline for filing non-dispositive motions	December 14, 2010	March 8, 2011
Deadline for hearing on non dispositive motions	January 26, 2011	April 20, 2011
Deadline for filing dispositive motions	February 11, 2011	May 2, 2011
Deadline for hearing on dispositive motions	March, 28, 2011	June 17, 2011
Pretrial conference	May 18, 2011	July 13, 2011
Trial	July 12, 2011	September 13, 2011

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

The parties also jointly request and HEREBY STIPULATE that Plaintiff not be precluded from seeking such further scheduling relief as may be necessary in this case, including, for example, as a result of discovery issues that arose prior to the stay, or which may arise going forward. Also, Plaintiff will not be precluded, due, for example, to the passage of time, from introducing any evidence or argument at a postponed trial that Plaintiff would otherwise have been entitled to introduce at a trial held on July 12, 2011.

IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD:

DATED: October __, 2010 SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD LLP

By: /s/ Mark J. Hancock
Mark J. Hancock
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY

DATED: July ____, 2010 PETRIE, DORFMEIER & MORRIS, LLP

By: /s/ Sean T. O'Rourke
Sean T. O'Rourke

Attorneys for Defendants
TECH LOGISTICS CORPORATION, d/b/a SYSTEMS LOGISTICS SERVICES and d/b/a SYSTEMS LOGISTICS, a Texas Corporation; AGRI-COMM EXPRESS, INC., a California Corporation; TRUCKING EQUIPMENT COMPANY, INC., a Wisconsin Corporation; ELISEO ONTIVEROS VALDEZ, an individual.

///
///
///
///
///

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

DATED: October __, 2010 WILKINS, DROLSHAGEN & CZESHINSKI LLP

By: /s/ James H. Wilkins
James H. Wilkins
Attorneys for Defendants
CONCEPCION GARCIA, an individual; and QUETZAL
GARCIA, a minor child

ORDER

Pursuant to the stipulation of the Parties, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 20, 2010 /s/ Michael J. Seng
U. S. Magistrate Judge