

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASEY ARNDT,

CASE NO. C-13-000372-NJV

Plaintiff(s),

STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

v.

CITY OF ARCATA, et al.,

Defendant(s).

_____ /

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

Court Processes:

- Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)
- Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)
- Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

Private ADR (*please identify process and provider*). Depending upon results of the court appointed mediator, parties may choose private mediation.

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

- the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.*)
- other requested deadline _____

Dated: April 9, 2013

/s/ Patrik Griego _____

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: April 9, 2013

/s/ David W. Hamilton _____

Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Defendants CSU
and Officer Delmar Tompkins

Dated: April 9, 2013

/s/ Nancy K. Delaney _____

Attorneys for Defendant
City of Arcata

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

- The parties' stipulation is adopted and IT IS SO ORDERED.
- The parties' stipulation is modified as follows, and IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/29/13



Judge Nandor J. Vadas
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE