Ddc. 66

Dockets.Justia.com

RECITALS

Plaintiff City of Los Angeles ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Verizon" or "Defendant") (collectively the "Parties") state as follows:

- 1. On September 9, 2016, the City of Los Angeles filed a Complaint in Intervention, in the above-referenced matter, naming Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless and Does 11-20 as Defendants in its case against Verizon ("Complaint").
- Defendant removed this action to this Court by filing a Notice of Removal on October 7,
 and Plaintiff moved to remand or, in the alternative, to transfer the case to the Eastern District of California.
- 3. On April 17, 2017 the Honorable Dale S. Fischer denied Plaintiff's motion to remand, but granted Plaintiff's alternative motion to transfer the matter to the Eastern District.
- 4. The parties previously agreed that Defendant's motion to dismiss this case would be filed on June 30, 2017, and that Plaintiff's opposition would be due on August 11, 2017. *See* ECF No. 64.
- 5. Counsel for Plaintiff and counsel for Defendant have met and conferred regarding the current deadline for Defendant to file its motion to dismiss and the briefing schedule, and due to an emergent matter, the parties have agreed to a very brief extension of dates for their initial filings. These brief extensions will have no impact on the date for Defendant's reply brief, which shall remain due on August 24, 2017, as set forth in the parties' Rule 26(f) Report, nor will it impact the hearing date, which remains September 7, 2017.
- 6. The parties also do not seek to alter the briefing schedule in the two cases related to this matter.
- 7. The parties shall not file any further requests for extensions relating to Defendant's motion to dismiss.

STIPULATION

It is hereby stipulated and agreed between the Parties as follows that:

- 8. Defendant has up to and including July 6, 2017 to file its motion to dismiss.
- 9. Plaintiff's opposition will be due on August 17, 2017.
- 10. Defendant's reply will be due on August 24, 2017.

1	11. Given the above, the lack of prejudice to either side, and the retention of the date for (i)
2	Defendant's reply brief and (ii) the hearing date of September 7, 2017 and for cause, the Parties
3	respectfully request that the Court approve this Stipulation and order that Defendant's motion to dismiss
4	be due by July 6, 2017 and Plaintiff's opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss be due August 17,
5	2017.
6	
7	Dated: June 29, 2017 Respectfully submitted,
8	GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
9	$\mathbf{p}_{m} = \sqrt{a/K}$
10	By: <u>/s/Kurt A. Kappes</u> Kurt A. Kappes
11	Attorneys for Defendant CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A
12	VERIZON WIRELESS
13	
14	Dated: June 29, 2017 COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY LLP
15	
16	By: <u>/s/ Eric J. Buescher</u> (as authorized 6/29/17) ERIC J. BUESCHER
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff City of Los Angeles
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
I	II

ORDER

The Court, having reviewed the stipulation to extend time for Defendant to file its motion to dismiss orders as follows:

- 1. Defendant has up to and including July 6, 2017 to file a motion to dismiss.
- 2. Plaintiff's opposition will be due on August 17, 2017.
- 3. Defendant's reply will be due on August 24, 2017

IT IS SO ORDERED

Date: June 29, 2017

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge