

KNOX, LEMMON & ANAPOLSKY, LLP  
2339 GOLD MEADOW WAY, SUITE 205, GOLD RIVER, CA 95670  
TELE: (916) 498-9911 FAX: (916) 498-9991

1 KNOX, LEMMON & ANAPOLSKY, LLP  
2 THOMAS S. KNOX (SBN 073384)  
3 2339 Gold Meadow Way, Suite 205  
4 Gold River, CA 95670  
5 Telephone: (916) 498-9911  
6 Facsimile: (916) 498-9991  
7  
8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 THE PUBLIC GROUP, LLC,  
10 a Utah limited liability company

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 CHRISTINE L. BAILEY

CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01725-TLN-DB

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

**STIPULATION AND ORDER  
EXTENDING TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO  
REPLY TO THE OPPOSITIONS TO THE  
MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

16 MICHAEL J. MacFARLAND,  
17 and THE PUBLIC GROUP, a Utah  
18 Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1-  
19 20, inclusive,

20 Defendants.

Date action filed: August 13, 2015  
Trial Date: TBA

**STIPULATION EXTENDING TIME FOR DEFENDANT  
TO REPLY TO THE OPPOSITIONS TO THE MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

21 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 6, and Local Rule 144, Plaintiff  
22 CHRISTINE L. BAILEY (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant THE PUBLIC GROUP, LLC, a Utah limited  
23 liability company (“Defendant”), by and through their attorneys of record, hereby stipulate that:

- 24 1. On August 31, 2018, the Court issued its Order Granting Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for  
25 Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction with Leave to Amend (Docket No. 36.);  
26

1 2. On September 27, 2018, Plaintiff filed its Second Amended Complaint and Demand for Jury  
2 Trial (Docket No. 37.);

3 3. On October 8, 2018, Defendant filed its Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter  
4 Jurisdiction (Docket No. 38.);

5 4. On October 11, 2018, Defendant filed its Motion to Dismiss Second, Fifth, Seventh & Tenth  
6 Claims for Relief from Second Amended Complaint (Docket No. 39.);

7 5. On November 21, 2018, Plaintiff filed its Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject  
8 Matter Jurisdiction (Docket No. 40.);

9 6. On November 21, 2018, Plaintiff also filed its Motion to Substitute Deceased Party (Docket No.  
10 41.);

11 7. On November 21, 2018, Plaintiff also filed its Memorandum of Points and Authorities in  
12 Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Substitute Deceased Party (Docket No. 42.);

13 8. On November 21, 2018, Plaintiff also filed its Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of  
14 Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Docket No. 43.);

15 9. Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Docket No.  
16 43.) was inadvertently miscaptioned and intended to be Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss the  
17 Second, Fifth, Seventh and Tenth Causes of Action;

18 10. Plaintiff will file an Erratum to the Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter  
19 Jurisdiction (Docket No. 43.) to correct the caption;

20 11. The deadline for Defendant to file its Reply to the Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of  
21 Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Docket No. 40.) will be extended from November 29, 2018 until and  
22 including December 27, 2018;

23 12. The deadline for Defendant to file its Reply to the Opposition to Motion to Dismiss for Lack of  
24 Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Docket No. 43.) will be extended from November 29, 2018 until and  
25 including December 27, 2018;

26

27

28

1 13. The hearing date for Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction  
2 (Docket No. 38.) will be extended from December 6, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. until January 10, 2019 at 2:00  
3 p.m., to be heard concurrently with Plaintiff's Motion to Substitute Deceased Party;

4 14. The hearing date for Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Second, Fifth, Seventh & Tenth Claims for  
5 Relief from Second Amended Complaint (Docket No. 39.) will be extended from December 6, 2018 at  
6 2:00 p.m. until January 10, 2019 at 2:00 p.m., to be heard concurrently with Plaintiff's Motion to  
7 Substitute Deceased Party;

8 15. The need for these extensions became apparent to counsel for Plaintiff and Defendant during a  
9 telephone conference on November 26, 2018;

10 16. This is the first such extension of time for Defendant to reply to Docket Nos. 40 and 43; and

11 17. This is the first such extension of time for the hearing date for Docket Nos. 38 and 39.

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Dated: November 27, 2018

KNOX, LEMMON & ANAPOLSKY, LLP

14  
15 By:  /s/ Thomas S. Knox  
16 THOMAS S. KNOX, Attorneys for  
17 THE PUBLIC GROUP, LLC

18 Dated: November 27, 2018

CAROLE M. POPE, a Professional Corporation

19 By:  /s/ Carole M. Pope  
20 CAROLE M. POPE, Attorney for  
21 CHRISTINE L. BAILEY


22 **ORDER**

23  
24 Having reviewed the parties' Stipulation Extending Time for Defendant to Reply to the  
25 Oppositions to the Motions to Dismiss, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the  
26 deadline for Defendants to file their replies to the Oppositions to the Motions to Dismiss (Docket Nos.  
27

1 40 and 43.) whether by means of an Answer, a Motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
2 Procedure or other appropriate motion, will be extended from November 29, 2018 until and including  
3 December 27, 2018.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the hearing date for Defendant's Motions to Dismiss (Docket  
5 Nos. 38 and 39.) will be continued to January 10, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. from December 6, 2018 at 2:00 p.m.,  
6 to be heard concurrently with Plaintiff's Motion to Substitute Deceased Party (Docket No. 41.).

7  
8 Dated: November 28, 2018

9  
10  
11  
12   
13 Troy L. Nunley  
14 United States District Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27