1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	KAMALA D. HARRIS, State Bar No. 146672 Attorney General of California CHRISTOPHER J. BECKER, State Bar No. 230529 Supervising Deputy Attorney General DIANA ESQUIVEL, State Bar No. 202954 Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-4928 Facsimile: (916) 324-5205 E-mail: Diana.Esquivel@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendants DiNinni, Kenneally, Moore, Perez, Schwarzenegger, and their successin office	sors	
10	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SACRAMENTO DIVISION		
13		_	
14	MICHAEL BRODHEIM,	No. 2:05-cv-1512-LKK-GGH (PC)	
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR	
16	*	PLAINTIFF TO FILE A FIFTH	
17	v.	AMENDED COMPLAINT AND FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO THE	
18	LOUIE DININNI, et al.,	COMPLAINT THIRTY DAYS THEREAFTER	
19	Defendants.	Action Filed: Approx 20, 2005	
		Action Filed: August 30, 2005	
20		Action Filed: August 50, 2005	
20 21		Action Filed: August 50, 2005	
	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15((a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties,	
21			
21 22		(a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties, that Plaintiff will file a fifth amended complaint	
21 22 23	through their respective counsel of record, agree	a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties, that Plaintiff will file a fifth amended complaint ir response to the fifth amended complaint by	
21 22 23 24	through their respective counsel of record, agree by August 30, 2013, and Defendants will file the	(a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties, that Plaintiff will file a fifth amended complaint ir response to the fifth amended complaint by nat Defendants need not respond to the fourth	
21 22 23 24 25	through their respective counsel of record, agree by August 30, 2013, and Defendants will file the September 30, 2013. The parties further agree th	(a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties, that Plaintiff will file a fifth amended complaint ir response to the fifth amended complaint by nat Defendants need not respond to the fourth No. 70.) Good cause exists to grant this request	
21 22 23 24 25 26	through their respective counsel of record, agree by August 30, 2013, and Defendants will file the September 30, 2013. The parties further agree the amended complaint filed on July 1, 2013. (ECF	a)(2) and Local Rules 143 and 144, the parties, that Plaintiff will file a fifth amended complaint ir response to the fifth amended complaint by nat Defendants need not respond to the fourth No. 70.) Good cause exists to grant this request ous facts and claims in the complaint, and	

1 Plaintiff filed his fourth amended complaint on July 1, 2013. (ECF No. 70.) The complaint 2 named nine Defendants, several of which are the successors to Defendants previously named and 3 served in this action. Plaintiff seeks to amend the complaint to clarify who the newly named 4 Defendants are intended to replace as permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d). 5 Plaintiff also wishes to clarify other facts asserted in the complaint. 6 Defense counsel will require an extension to respond to the fifth amended complaint (or 7 fourth amended complaint if the Court denies this request) because of her trial calendar. She is 8 currently preparing for trial in the matters *Fields v. Junious* (E.D. Cal. No. 1:09-cv-1771 DLB) 9 and Coston-Moore v. Medina (E.D. Cal. No. 1:06-cv-01183 RC), which are scheduled to start on 10 August 5 and 12, respectively. These trials are expected to go forward on the scheduled dates 11 because *Fields* was continued to August 5, so Magistrate Judge Beck could preside over the trial, 12 and Judge Collins is coming from Arizona to try Coston-Moore. 13 On June 7, when the parties stipulated to the July 31 deadline for Defendants to respond to 14 the fourth amended complaint, defense counsel was unaware that she would be in trial on August 15 5. Fields was reassigned to Magistrate Beck, and the August 5 trial date was set on June 26. (See 16 Fields ECF Nos. 137, 138.) After the Fields and Coston-Moore trials, defense counsel will start 17 preparing for trial in McDonald v. Yates (E.D. Cal. No. 1:09-cv-00730 SKO), which is scheduled 18 /// 19 /// 20 /// 21 /// 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 28

1	to start on September 17, 2013, in addition to meeting deadlines in her other cases. For these		
2	reasons, Defendants will require more time than that permitted under Rule 15 to prepare their		
3	response to the fifth amended complaint.		
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
5			
6	Dated: July 31, 2013	Respectfully submitted,	
7		KAMALA D. HARRIS	
8		Attorney General of California CHRISTOPHER J. BECKER	
9		Supervising Deputy Attorney General	
10		/s/ Diana Esquivel	
11		DIANA ESQUIVEL	
12		Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants	
13	D . 1 1 21 2012	//	
14	Dated: July 31, 2013	/s/ Joseph D. Elford	
15		Josepн D. Elford Attorneys for Plaintiff	
16			
17			
18	SA2006300949		
19	31746052.doc		
20	20		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		2	
	Stipulation and Order for Plaintiff to File a Fifth Amend	3 led Complaint and For Defendants to Respond to the	
	Complaint Thirty Days Thereafter (2:05-cv-1512-LKK-GGH)		

1	ORDER		
2	Based on the parties' stipulation and good cause appearing, Defendants need not respond to		
3	the fourth amended and supplemental complaint, filed on July 1, 2013. (See ECF No. 70.)		
4	Plaintiff shall file his fifth amended complaint by no later than August 30, 2013. Defendants		
5	shall respond to the fifth amended complaint by no later than September 30, 2013.		
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
7	7		
8	B DATED: August 13, 2013	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows	
9			
10		Gregory G. Hollows United States Magistrate Judge	
Brod1512.stip-5AC			
12			
13	3		
14			
15			
16	5		
17			
18	3		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	3	4	