

1 LAURA J. FOWLER (Bar No. 186097)
 2 laura.fowler@bbklaw.com
 3 Best Best & Krieger LLP
 4 500 Capitol Mall
 5 Suite 1700
 6 Sacramento, CA 95814
 7 Telephone: (916) 325-4000
 8 Facsimile: (916) 325-4010

9 PAUL H. SINCLAIR (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
 10 paul.sinclair@icemiller.com
 11 Ice Miller LLP
 12 One American Square, Suite 2900
 13 Indianapolis, IN 46282
 14 Telephone: (317) 236-2176
 15 Facsimile: (317) 592-4759

16 Attorneys for Defendant
 17 Kasco Corporation

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 19 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 ANTHONY SPRADLIN, an individual,
 21 GARY ALLEN, an individual, and DAVID
 22 SAMUELSON, an individual,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 KASCO CORPORATION, a Delaware
 26 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
 27 inclusive,

28 Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-02260-TLN-AC

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR
 EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
 SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT AND
 FOR STAY OF PROCEEDINGS**

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 144(a), the parties hereby stipulate as follows:

2 Laura J. Fowler, Best Best & Kreiger, LLP, and Paul H. Sinclair, Ice Miller LLP,
3 attorneys for defendant, Kasco Corporation (“Defendant”) and Rory C. Quintana, Quintana
4 Albert LLP, attorney for plaintiffs, Anthony Spradlin, Gary Allen, and David Samuelson, hereby
5 stipulate to a three-week extension for Defendant to respond to the Second Amended Complaint
6 filed in this matter on February 28, 2014. The parties have mediated this matter, reached a
7 settlement, and filed a notice of settlement. The parties are in the process of submitting a request
8 to the Court for approval of the settlement and dismissal of this action (under a request to file
9 documents under seal). A response to the Second Amended Complaint is due on or about March
10 21, 2014. Given the pendency of the settlement and the imminent request for Court approval, the
11 parties have agreed to postpone the deadline for responding to the Second Amended Complaint to
12 April 11, 2014. The parties have also agreed to temporarily stay these proceedings pending the
13 Court’s consideration of the anticipated motion for approval of the settlement, so that neither
14 party propounds discovery or is obligated to comply with any previously established deadlines
15 unrelated to the request for Court approval of the settlement.

16 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

17 Dated: March 21, 2014

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP

18

19 By: /s/Laura J. Fowler

LAURA J. FOWLER
Attorneys for Defendant
Kasco Corporation

20

21

22

23 Dated: March 21, 2014

ICE MILLER LLP

24

25 By: /s/Paul H. Sinclair

PAUL H. SINCLAIR
Attorneys for Defendant
Kasco Corporation

26

27

28

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


Dated: March 21, 2014

QUINTANA ALBERT LLP

BY: /s/Rory C. Quintana
RORY C. QUINTANA
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Anthony Spradlin

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2014



Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge