REITH A. JACOBY, Bar No. 150233			
6 LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. Treat Towers 7 1255 Treat Boulevard, Suite 600 Walnut Creek, CA 94597 Telephone: 925,932,2468 Facsimile: 925,946,9809 9 SOPHIA BEHNIA, Bar No. 289318 sbehnia@littler.com PERRY K. MISKA, IR, Bar No. 299129 pmiska@littler.com LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 333 Bush Street, 34th Floor San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: 415,433,1940 Facsimile: 415,399,8490 14 15 Attorneys for Defendant T-MOBILE USA, INC. 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 18 19 EMMANUEL SALGADO, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, V. 17 T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, Defendant. 18 Defendant. 19 Case No. 1:17-cv-00339-DAD-JLT JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMITATION FOR DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND IPROPOSED] ORDER (Doc. 33)	2	kjacoby@littler.com LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 2049 Century Park East, 5th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067.3107 Telephone: 310.553.0308	
Facsimile: 415.399.8490 Attorneys for Defendant T-MOBILE USA, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA EMMANUEL SALGADO, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, Plaintiff, V. T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, Defendant. Case No. 1:17-cv-00339-DAD-JLT JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMITATION FOR DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S ROTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (Doc. 33)	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	giskander@littler.com LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. Treat Towers 1255 Treat Boulevard, Suite 600 Walnut Creek, CA 94597 Telephone: 925.932.2468 Facsimile: 925.946.9809 SOPHIA BEHNIA, Bar No. 289318 sbehnia@littler.com PERRY K. MISKA, JR, Bar No. 299129 pmiska@littler.com LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 333 Bush Street, 34th Floor San Francisco, California 94104	
T-MOBILE USA, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA EMMANUEL SALGADO, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, V. T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, Defendant. Case No. 1:17-cv-00339-DAD-JLT JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMITATION FOR DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (Doc. 33)		Telephone: 415.433.1940	
EMMANUEL SALGADO, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, Defendant. Case No. 1:17-cv-00339-DAD-JLT JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMITATION FOR DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (Doc. 33)	16 17	T-MOBÎLE USA, INC. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	20212223242526	himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,	JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMITATION FOR DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
	28		

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. Treat Towers 1255 Treat Boulevard Suite 600 Walnut Creek, CA 94597 925.932.2468

CASE NO. 1:17-CV-00339-DAD-JLT

JOINT STIPULATION EXTENDING PAGE LIMIT FOR DEFT'S OPPOSITION AND PL'S REPLY BRIEFS AND [PROPOSED] ORDER

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TLER MENDELSON, P.C.

Treat Towers

Subject to the approval of this Court, Plaintiff EMMANUEL SALGADO and Defendant T-MOBILE USA, INC., through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate pursuant to Local Rule 143 as follows:

- 1. Parties have agreed to a stipulation that Plaintiff and Defendant shall have a short ten page extension on Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification, and Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of his Motion for Class Certification. Accordingly, Defendant may be permitted to file an Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification in excess of the existing page limit, as provided by the Court's August 28, 2017 Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 23), up to 40 pages in length, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorities and supporting documents. Plaintiff likewise may be permitted to file a Reply Brief in Support of his Motion for Class Certification in excess of the existing page limit, as provided by the Court's August 28, 2017 Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 23), up to 25 pages in length, exclusive of the caption page, table of contents, table of authorizes and supporting documents.
- 2. Good cause exists for granting this stipulation. While the parties appreciate the importance of brevity, the parties will be contesting and analyzing the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(a) factors of commonality, typicality, adequacy, all of the Rule 23(b) factors (including predominance and superiority), Plaintiff's proposed trial management plan, and numerous factual and credibility issues of the case. Thus, the additional ten pages are necessary to allow the parties to respond fully and adequately address all of these issues and arguments.
- 3. The parties have agreed to a mutual ten page extension of the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification, and the Memorandum of Points and Authorities In Support of Plaintiff's Reply Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

///

/// ///

///

1	Dated: March 25, 2019	LAW OFFICES OF KEVIN T. BARNES
2 3 4 5		By: /s/ Kevin T. Barnes Kevin T. Barnes, Esq. Gregg Lander, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff Emmanuel Salgado
6 7	Dated: March 25, 2019	LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
8 9 10 11		By: /s/ Perry Miska KEITH A. JACOBY GREGORY G. ISKANDER SOPHIA BEHNIA PERRY K. MISKA Littler Mendelson, P.C. Attorneys for Defendant
12 13	<u>[PRC</u>	T-MOBILE USA, INC. PPOSED ORDER
1415161718	The Court will grant the stipulation to allow the parties to exceed the page limitations for the opposition to the motion for class certification (up to 40 pages) and the reply (up to 25 pages). However, counsel SHALL make best efforts to edit the briefs, so they are concise, with no repetition or needless block quotes. They are reminded that often, more is not better; it is just more.	
19 20 21	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 28, 2019	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22 23		
242526		
262728		

CASE NO. 1:17-CV-00339-DAD-JLT