	C	ase 3:06-cv-01802-MHP Document 102	Filed 03/13/2007 Page 1 of 3	
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES 2001 Center Street, Third Floor Berkeley, CA 94704-1204 (510) 665-8644	1 2 3 4 5	LAURENCE W. PARADIS (California Bar No ROGER N. HELLER (California Bar No. 2153) DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES 2001 Center Street, Third Floor Berkeley, California 94704 Telephone: (510) 665-8644 Facsimile: (510) 665-8511 TTY: (510) 665-8716 JOSHUA KONECKY (California Bar No. 1828 RACHEL BRILL (California Bar No. 233294)	48)	
	7 8 9	SCHNEIDER & WALLACE 180 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 421-7100 Fax: (415) 421-7105 TTY: (415) 421-1655		
	10111213	DANIEL F. GOLDSTEIN (pro hac vice) BROWN, GOLDSTEIN & LEVY, LLP 120 E. Baltimore St., Suite 1700 Baltimore, MD 21202 Telephone: (410) 962-1030 Fax: (410) 385-0869	PETER BLANCK (pro hac vice) 900 S. Crouse Ave. Crouse-Hinds Hall, Suite 300 Syracuse, NY 13244-2130 Telephone: (315) 443-9703 Fax: (315) 443-9725	
	14 15	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
	16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	17			
	18	NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE	Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP	
	19	BLIND, the NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND OF CALIFORNIA, on behalf of	CLASS ACTION	
	20	their members and all others similarly situated, and BRUCE F. SEXTON, on behalf of himself	PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF NON-	
	21	and all others similarly situated,	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME AND	
	22	Plaintiffs,	REQUEST FOR RELIEF FROM BRIEFING SCHEDULE	
	23	v.	Hearing Date: April 12, 2007	
	24	TARGET CORPORATION	Time: 2:30 PM Judge: The Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel	
	25	Defendant.		
	26			
	27			
	28			
		National Federation of the Blind, et al. v. Target Corpora Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP Plaintiffs' Statement of Non-Opposition to Defendant's M Briefing Schedule		

Dockets.Justla.com

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

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

Having read Defendant's motion for summary judgment and supporting papers, Plaintiffs				
do not oppose Defendant's request that the Court hear Defendant's motion, on shortened time, on				
April 12, 2007. However, given that Plaintiffs will be busy working on their reply papers in				
support of their pending motions for class certification and bifurcation, and given the substantial				
overlap of issues among the various motions, Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to allow				
Plaintiffs an additional week to file their opposition to Defendant's motion for summary				
judgment. Plaintiffs propose the following briefing/hearing schedule for the pending motions in				
this case:				

Date	Event
March 29, 2007	Plaintiffs' Opposition to Summary Judgment
	Due
March 29, 2007	Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class
·	Certification and Bifurcation Due
April 5, 2007	Defendant's Reply in Support of Summary
	Judgment Due
April 12, 2007, 2:30pm	Hearing on Motions for Class Certification,
	Bifurcation, and Summary Judgment

Defendant has indicated to Plaintiffs that it does not oppose Plaintiffs' request to the Court to set the briefing schedule as set forth above.

This proposed schedule would coordinate the filing of Plaintiffs' reply in support of their motions for class certification and bifurcation with the filing of Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment. This proposed schedule would not prejudice Defendant, who would still have one week to respond to Plaintiffs' opposition to their summary judgment motion. Plaintiffs recognize, however, that this proposed schedule would allow the Court only 7 days between receiving Defendant's reply in support of its summary judgment motion and the hearing on that motion, rather than the standard 14 days.

National Federation of the Blind, et al. v. Target Corporation, et al.

Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP

Plaintiffs' Statement of Non-Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Shorten Time and Request for Relief from **Briefing Schedule**

Berkeley, CA 94704-1204

Plaintiffs respectfully ask the Court to adopt the briefing/hearing schedule above, but in any event, do not oppose Defendant's current motion to shorten time. Plaintiffs do not ask the Court to change the briefing schedule in any way that would change the April 12, 2007 hearing date for the pending motions.

DATED: March 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted, DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES SCHNEIDER & WALLACE BROWN, GOLDSTEIN & LEVY, LLP PETER BLANCK, J.D., Ph.D.

Roøer Heller

Attorney for Plaintiff

National Federation of the Blind, et al. v. Target Corporation, et al.

Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP

Plaintiffs' Statement of Non-Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Shorten Time and Request for Relief from Briefing Schedule