

1 JORDAN ETH (BAR NO. 121617)  
[JEth@mofo.com](mailto:JEth@mofo.com)  
 2 JUDSON E. LOBDELL (BAR NO. 146041)  
[JLobdell@mofo.com](mailto:JLobdell@mofo.com)  
 3 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 425 Market Street  
 4 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
 Telephone: 415.268.7000  
 5 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

6 Attorneys for Defendants  
 MARRONE BIO INNOVATIONS, INC., PAMELA G.  
 7 MARRONE, DONALD J. GLIDEWELL, JAMES B. BOYD,  
 ELIN MILLER, RANJEET BHATIA, TIMOTHY FOGARTY,  
 8 LAWRENCE HOUGH, JOSEPH HUDSON, RICHARD  
 ROMINGER, SEAN SCHICKEDANZ, and SHAUGN  
 9 STANLEY

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12  
 13  
 14 KENT OLDHAM, Individually and On Behalf of  
 All Others Similarly Situated,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 MARRONE BIO INNOVATIONS, INC.,  
 JAMES B. BOYD, DONALD J.  
 18 GLIDEWELL, PAMELA G. MARRONE,  
 ELIN MILLER, RANJEET BHATIA, TIM  
 19 FOGARTY, LAWRENCE HOUGH, JOSEPH  
 HUDSON, RICHARD ROMINGER, SEAN  
 20 SCHICKEDANZ, SHAUGN STANLEY,  
 PIPER JAFFRAY & CO., STIFEL,  
 21 NICOLAUS & COMPANY,  
 INCORPORATED, ROTH CAPITAL  
 22 PARTNERS, LLC and JEFFERIES LLC,

23 Defendants.  
 24

Case No. 14-cv-02130-WBS-DAD

**STIPULATION AND ORDER  
 DEFERRING DEADLINES TO  
 RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT**

Judge: Hon. William B. Shubb  
 Date Filed: Sept. 15, 2014  
 Trial Date: None Set

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 144 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6, the parties hereby  
2 stipulate, subject to the Court’s approval, as follows:

3 WHEREAS, this securities class action lawsuit was instituted in this district on  
4 September 15, 2014, on behalf of all persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the publicly  
5 traded securities of Marrone Bio Innovations, Inc. (“Marrone”) between August 2, 2013, and  
6 September 2, 2014;

7 WHEREAS, this securities class action lawsuit is governed by the Private Securities  
8 Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4 *et seq.* (the “Reform Act”);

9 WHEREAS, a lead plaintiff has not yet been appointed pursuant to 15 U.S.C.  
10 § 78u-4(a)(3)(B) of the Reform Act;

11 WHEREAS, counsel for the parties have met and conferred and agreed that the due date  
12 for defendants’ responses to the complaint should be deferred until a lead plaintiff is appointed;

13 WHEREAS, the agreed-upon extension is not for the purpose of delay, promotes judicial  
14 efficiency, and will not cause prejudice to either party;

15 WHEREAS, no previous extension of this deadline has been sought;

16 NOW, THEREFORE,

17 Without prejudice to any parties’ right to seek interim relief, Defendants shall have no  
18 obligation to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint until after the Court appoints a lead  
19 plaintiff and lead counsel pursuant to the provisions of the Reform Act. Defendants will meet and  
20 confer with the court-appointed lead counsel within twenty (20) days following the appointment  
21 of a lead plaintiff and lead counsel to (a) confirm whether the lead plaintiff will file a new  
22 complaint that supersedes all previously filed complaints or deem the existing complaint  
23 operative; and (b) establish a common response date for all defendants, including a briefing  
24 schedule on defendants’ anticipated motions to dismiss.  
25  
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

GREEN & NOBLIN P.C.

By: /s/ Lesley Weaver as authorized on  
10/14/2014

Lesley Weaver

GREEN & NOBLIN P.C.  
700 Larkspur Landing Circle  
Suite 275  
Larkspur, California 94939  
United States


Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

**ORDER**

Pursuant to the stipulation, it is SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 15, 2014

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM B. SHUBB  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE