D\( \phi \). 7

Dockets.Justia.com

-DAD Losel v. Chase Bank USA, N.A. et al

## **STIPULATION**

WHEREAS, on May 2, 2011, plaintiff Ronald L. Losel ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint (the "Complaint") against defendants Chase Bank USA, N.A. ("Chase") and Donald M. Palmer, D.C. ("Palmer")<sup>1</sup>;

WHEREAS, the Complaint and Summons were served on and received by Chase after July 1, 2011;

WHEREAS, Chase timely filed its Notice of Removal with this Court on July 29, 2011;

WHEREAS, Chase must answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint by August 10,

2011;

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

WHEREAS, counsel for Chase and Plaintiff have agreed to extend the date by which Chase must answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint to September 16, 2011;

WHEREAS, counsel for Chase has prior commitments justifying the extension;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Local Rule 144, an initial stipulation extending time to respond to a complaint may be filed without approval of the Court if the stipulation is signed on behalf of all parties affected by the stipulation;

WHEREAS, no previous extensions have been requested; and

WHEREAS, this Stipulation is made in good faith and not for purposes of delay.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties, through their respective counsel of record, that Chase's time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint hereby is extended to September 16, 2011.

Dated: August 2, 2011

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP JULIA B. STRICKLAND STEPHEN J. NEWMAN

By: /s/ Stephen J. Newman
Stephen J. Newman

Attorneys for Defendant CHASE BANK USA, N.A.

-1-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All of Plaintiff's individual claims against Palmer have been settled and dismissed.

| STROOCK & LAVAN LLP<br>2029 Century Park East<br>Los Angeles, California 90067-3086 | 1 2 | Dated: August 2, 2011 MAJORS & FOX LLP FRANK J. FOX |
|---|-----|---|
|   | 3   |   |
|   | 4   | By: /s/ Frank J. Fox Frank J. Fox                   |
|   | 5   |   |
|   | 6   | Attorneys for Plaintiff<br>Ronald L. Losel          |
|   | 7   |   |
|   | 8   |   |
|   | 9   |   |
|   | 10  | <u>ORDER</u>  |
|   | 11  | PURSUANT TO THE STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.      |
|   | 12  |   |
|   | 13  | Dated: August 8, 2011                               |
|   | 14  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE                        |
|   | 15  |   |
|   | 16  |   |
|   | 17  |   |
|   | 18  |   |
|   | 19  |   |
|   | 20  |   |
|   | 21  |   |
|   | 22  |   |
|   | 23  |   |
|   | 24  |   |
|   | 25  |   |
|   | 26  |   |
|   | 27  |   |
|   | 28  |   |
|   |     | -2-   |