24

25

26

27

28

Lawrence D. Murray (SBN 77536) MURRAY & ASSOCIATES 1781 Union Street San Francisco, CA 94123 Tel: (415) 673-0555 Fax: (415) 928-4084

Attorneys for Plaintiff MAGGIE FRANKLIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Eastern District of California

Sacramento Division

MAGGIE FRANKLIN,

Plaintiff,

VS.

SACRAMENTO AREA FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY, a public entity, CITY OF SACRAMENTO, a public agency, STEIN BUER, and JULIE LEINERT

Defendants.

No. 2:07-CV-01263-WBS-GGH

EXPARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER, DECLARATION IN SUPPORT THEREOF, AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO MODIFY PRETRIAL CONFERENCE STATEMENT FILING DEADLINE FOR PLAINTIFF'S PRETRIAL CONFERENCE STATEMENT TO APRIL 2, 2009

Plaintiff's PTC Statement Date: April 1, 2009 Complaint Filed: June 26, 2007

1st Amended Complaint Filed: June 16, 2008

APPLICATION FOR ORDER

Plaintiff MAGGIE FRANKLIN by and through her attorneys of record, hereby requests the Court further modify the Pre-Trial Scheduling Order by extending the date for filing Plaintiff's final Pre Trial Conference Statements by one day. It is requested that the plaintiff submit her final Pre Trial Conference Statements, which is currently set for April 1, 2009, be extended to April 2, 2009.

Jury trial in this case is currently scheduled for May 27, 2009. The pretrial conference is currently set for Monday, April 6, 2009.

Franklin v. Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency, et al.

Page 1

United States District Court, Eastern District of California Case No. 2:07-CV-01263-WBS-GGH

Exparte App, Dec, & Order Modify Filing Deadline For Plaintiff's Pretrial Con Stmnt To April 2, 2009

Good cause exists to change the Final Pre-Trial Conference Statement due date because after a week of depositions in Fresno in a similar type case, plaintiff's counsel has just returned to San Francisco to prepare the Pretrial Conference Statement for plaintiff, and that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment ("Defendants' Motion") against all of Plaintiff's nine claims for relief and ruling from the Court was pending before the Court until last week. The hearing for Defendants' Motion came before the Court on March 16, 2009, at 2:00 p.m., and the Final Pre-Trial Conference is scheduled to occur by the Court's order on April 6, 2009.

On March 16, 2009, at the hearing on Defendants' Motion, the Court suggested that the parties should meet and confer regarding the Statements' due dates since the Court wanted to keep the Pre-Trial Conference on the same date (not continue the April 6, 2009, Pre-Trial Conference) and anticipated that a ruling may be issued some time during the week of March 23, 2009. At the time of the hearing the Court and the parties believed that obtaining the Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment before preparing their Separate Pre-Trial Statements would result in a more efficient and effective use of the Court's and Parties' time and resources.

Since offering to consider a continuance of the filing of the pretrial order, the parties, have submitted one stipulation for and the Court has ordered a continuance of the filing to April 1, 2009.

Plaintiff's counsel has asked defendant's counsel, Carl L. Fessenden, for a stipulation to extend plaintiff's filing of the Pretrial Statement by one day. Mr. Fessenden has indicated that he could not stipulate to it but would have no objection to plaintiff being granted an additional 24 hours for the filing of the Pretrial Statement. When asked if he would like the same extension, Mr. Fessenden indicated that he will be filing the statement for defendants on April 1, 2009, if not before. For this reason, the parties respectfully request the Court modify the Pre Trial Scheduling Order so that final Pre Trial Conference Statements for plaintiff be due April 2, 2009.

DATED: Respectfully submitted,

MURRAY & ASSOCIATES

/s/ Lawrence D. Murray
LAWRENCE D. MURRAY
Attorneys for Plaintiff Maggie Franklin

///

11/

DECLARATION OF LAWRENCE D. MURRAY IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR ORDER OF THE COURT TO EXTEND THE FILING OF THE PLAINTIFF'S PRETRIAL CONFERENCE STATEMENT BY ONE DAY

I, Lawrence D. Murray, declare:

- 1. I am the attorney for plaintiff who is charged with the responsibility to represent her at trial of this matter.
- 2. I request the order of this court that the Plaintiff's Pre Trial Conference Statements, which is currently set to be filed on April 1, 2009, be extended to on or before April 2, 2009.
- 3. Jury trial in this case is currently scheduled for May 27, 2009. The pretrial conference is currently set for Monday, April 6, 2009.
- 4. Good cause exists to change the Final Pre-Trial Conference Statement due date because I have just returned to San Francisco to prepare the Pretrial Conference Statement for plaintiff after spending the last week in depositions all day in Fresno in a matter set for trial in Fresno on April 27, 2009.
- 5. Though I have been diligently working on the plaintiff's Pretrial Statement, as of yet I do not believe it will be finished and ready for filing by 11:59 p.m. on April 1, 2009.
- 6. The hearing on the Pretrial Statement has been delayed to permit the hearing and order on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, or in the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment ("Defendants' Motion") against all of Plaintiff's nine claims for relief and ruling from the Court. This ruling was pending before the Court until last week.
- 7. The hearing for Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment or Partial Summary Judgment came before the Court on March 16, 2009 2:00 p.m., and the Final Pre-Trial Conference is scheduled to occur by the Court's order on April 6, 2009.
- 8. On March 16, 2009, at the hearing on Defendants' Motion, I am informed by the attorney present for plaintiff and the attorney present for defendants that the Court suggested that the parties should meet and confer regarding the Statements' due dates since the Court wanted to keep the Pre-Trial Conference on the same date (not continue the April 6, 2009, Pre-Trial Conference) and anticipated that a ruling may be issued some time during the week of March 23, 2009. At the time of the hearing the Court and the parties believed that obtaining the Court's ruling on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment before preparing their Separate Pre-Trial Statements would result in the more efficient and effective use of the Court's and Parties' time and resources.