1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JOHN L. BURRIS, ESQ. CSB#69888 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS Airport Corporate Centre 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120 Oakland, CA 94621-1939 Tel: (510) 839-5200 Fax: (510) 839-5200 Fax: (510) 839-3882 E/M: John.Burris@JohnBurrisLaw.com Attorneys for Gregory Williams DALE L. ALLEN, JR., SBN 145279 KEVIN P. ALLEN, JR., SBN 145279 KEVIN P. ALLEN, SBN 252290 LOW, BALL & LYNCH 505 Montgomery Street, 7 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 Tel: (415)981-6630 Fax: (415) 982-1634 E/M: dallen@lowball.com E/M: kallen@lowball.com Attorneys for Defendants	DAVID E. DRIVON, ESQ. #158369 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID DRIVON 215 N. San Joaquin Street Stockton, CA 95202 Tel: (209) 942-3276 Fax: (209) 463-7668 E/M: <u>Ddrivon@ Comcast.net</u>
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
15	EASTERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
16	(FRI	ESNO)
17	GREGORY WILLIAMS,	Case 1:10-cv-01999-MJS
18		
18 19	Plaintiff, vs	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION
19	Plaintiff, vs	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
19 20	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION
19 20 21	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE
19 20 21 22	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS'
19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1 through 15, inclusive,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE
19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1 through 15, inclusive,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE
19 20 21 22 23 24	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1 through 15, inclusive,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiff, vs CITY OF MERCED; a municipal corporation; Merced police Officer PINNEGAR (ID#215) individually and in his official capacity as a police officer for the CITY OF MERCED; and DOES 1 through 15, inclusive,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, DEFENDANTS' REPLY BRIEF AND THE HEARING DATE

1	The parties, Plaintiff Gregory Williams, and Defendants City of Merced, Officers
2	Pinnegar, et al., by and through their respective attorneys, stipulate that the time for filing
3	all remaining documents and noticed hearing in this matter be extended by one week, i.e.:
4	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment from December 28,
5 6	2012 to January 4, 2013; Defendants' Reply Brief from January 4, 2013 to January 11,
7	2013, and the hearing in this matter from January 11, 2013 to January 18, 2013.
8	1. This action arises out of an encounter between Plaintiff Gregory Williams
9	and Defendant City of Merced Police Officers, including Defendant Officer Pinnegar, in
10	Plaintiff's home on September 9, 2009, from which Plaintiff suffered injuries and was
11	ultimately arrested.
12	2. Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Damages for Violation of Civil Rights on
13	October 21, 2010.
14 15	3. Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on December 14, 2012.
16	4. According to the Court's scheduling order, Plaintiff's Opposition to
17	Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is due on December 28, 2012; Defendant's
18	Reply is due on January 4, 2013, and the hearing is noticed for January 11, 2013.
19	5. Due to the Plaintiff's counsels' heavy caseload, holiday schedule and
20	holiday travel plans, Plaintiff needs additional time in which to prepare Plaintiff's
21	
22	Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. Because extending time to file
23	Plaintiff's Opposition Brief implicates all other deadlines in this matter, the parties request
24	that all remaining deadlines and the hearing date regarding Defendants' Motion for
25 26	Summary Judgment be extended by one week, as follows: Plaintiff's Opposition to
20	
28	
	PARTIES JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME Case 1:10-cv-01999-OWW-MJS 2

1	Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment due on January 4, 2013; Defendants' Reply		
2	due on January 11, 2013, and the hearing be held on January 18, 2013.		
3			
4	6. To date, no previous time modifications have been made in this case by		
5	stipulation or by Court order.		
6	7. IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED between Plaintiff and the		
7	Defendants, through their respective counsel, that the time to file the remaining briefs in		
8	this matter and the scheduled hearing date be extended by one week, as follows: Plaintiff's		
9	Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment from December 28, 2012 to		
10	January 4, 2013, Defendants' Reply from January 4, 2013 to January 11, 2013, and the		
11	scheduled hearing from January 11, 2013, to January 18, 2013.		
12			
13	Dated: December 19, 2012 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS		
14			
15			
16	By: <u>/s/ Adante Pointer</u> Adanté Pointer, Esq.		
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
18			
19	Dated: December 19, 2012 LOW, BALL & LYNCH		
20			
21	By: <u>Kevin Allen</u>		
22	Kevin P. Allen Attorneys for Defendants		
23	<u>ORDER</u>		
24	Good cause appearing, it is so Ordered and the January 11, 2013 Hearing is continued to		
25	January 18, 2013.		
26			
27	Dated: January 2, 2013/s/Michael J. SengU.S. Magistrate Judge		
28			
	PARTIES JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME Case 1:10-cv-01999-OWW-MJS 3		

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	PARTIES JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME Case 1:10-cv-01999-OWW-MJS 4