1	LAW OFFICE OF STEWART KATZ	LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH C. GEORGE
2	Stewart Katz, SBN 127425 Guy Danilowitz, SBN 257733	Joseph C. George, Sr., SBN 119231 Joseph George, Jr., SBN 200999
3	555 University Avenue, Suite 270	601 University Ave, Suite 200
	Sacramento, CA 95825	Sacramento, CA 95825
4	Telephone: (916) 444-5678	Telephone: (916) 641-7300
5	Facsimile: (916) 444-3364	Facsimile: (916) 641-7303 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	Attorneys for Flamitins
7	LONGYEAR, O'DEA & LAVRA, LLP Van Longyear, SBN 84189	WILKE, FLEURY, HOFFELT, GOULD & BIRNEY, LLP
8	Jennifer Marquez, SBN 232194	Robert F. Tyler, SBN 063055
9	3620 American River Drive, Suite 230	400 Capitol Mall, 22 nd Floor
9	Sacramento, CA 95864 Telephone: (916) 974-8500	Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 441-2430
10	Facsimile: (916) 974-8510	Facsimile: (916) 442-6664
11	Attorneys for Defendants, County of Sacramento, John McGinness,	Attorneys for Defendants, Robert Hales, Paul Hendricks, Gregory
12	Scott Jones, Jamie Lewis, AnnMarie Boylan	Sokolov, and Dr. L. Michael Tompkins
13		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
1	EASTERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
4 ~		
15		
16	Estate of BALJIT SINGH, et al.	NO. 2:09-CV-01439-JAM-JFM
	Estate of BALJIT SINGH, et al. Plaintiffs,	NO. 2:09-CV-01439-JAM-JFM
16	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND
16 17	,	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL
16 17 18 19	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER
16 17 18	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL
16 17 18 19	Plaintiffs, vs.	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER
16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110]
16 17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants.	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110]
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the approval of this Court, hereby stipulate and	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to d respectfully request the following
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the approval of this Court, hereby stipulate an modifications and/or amendments to this Court	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to d respectfully request the following rt's Pretrial Scheduling Order of June 1, 2012
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the approval of this Court, hereby stipulate and	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to d respectfully request the following rt's Pretrial Scheduling Order of June 1, 2012
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the approval of this Court, hereby stipulate an modifications and/or amendments to this Court (Document 110), regarding the scheduling of	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to d respectfully request the following rt's Pretrial Scheduling Order of June 1, 2012
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Plaintiffs, vs. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. COME NOW THE PARTIES by and the approval of this Court, hereby stipulate an modifications and/or amendments to this Court (Document 110), regarding the scheduling of	STIPULATION AND ORDER MODIFYING PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER [DOCUMENT 110] *AS MODIFIED BY THE COURT through their respective parties and subject to d respectfully request the following rt's Pretrial Scheduling Order of June 1, 2012 this case: pposition to dispositive motions currently set

1	That the last day to file and serve a reply to an opposition to dispositive motions		
2	currently set for September 6, 2012 be moved to September 11, 2012.		
3	• That the dispositive motions currently set for September 19, 2012 at 9:30a.m. be		
4	moved to October 3, 2012 at 9:30	a.m.	
5	This calendaring modification is requested because plaintiffs are responding to tw		
6	motions for summary judgment brought by multiple parties on multiple claims, ar		
7	because the requested modification allows the moving parties additional time to file the		
8	replies. The requested modification does not change the trial date of January 14, 2013 of		
9	the Final Pretrial Conference date of November 9, 2012.		
10	Dated: August 20, 2012	LAW OFFICE OF STEWART KATZ	
11		/s/ Stewart Katz	
12		STEWART KATZ,	
13		Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
$\begin{bmatrix} 13 \\ 14 \end{bmatrix}$	Dated: August 20, 2012	LAW OFFICE OF JOSEPH C. GEORGE	
15		/s/ Joseph C. George, Sr.	
16		JOSEPH C. GEORGE, SR. Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
17		Attorneys for Flamith's	
18	Dated: August 20, 2012	LONGYEAR, O'DEA & LAVRA, LLP	
19		/s/ Van Longyear	
20		VAN LONGYEAR	
21		Attorneys for Defendants, County of Sacramento, John McGinness,	
22		Scott Jones, Jamie Lewis, AnnMarie Boylan	
23			
24	Dated: August 20, 2012	WILKE, FLEURY, HOFFELT, GOULD &	
25		BIRNEY, LLP	
26		/s/ Robert F. Tyler, Jr.	
27		ROBERT F. TYLER, JR. Attorneys for Defendants, Robert Hales,	
28		Paul Hendricks, Gregory Sokolov, and L. Michael Tompkins	

1	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
2		
3	Dated: 8/21/2012	
4		/s/ John A. Mendez The Honorable John A. Mendez
5		Judge of the U.S. District Court
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		