

1 JEFFREY L. BLEICH (State Bar No. 144340)
 2 DANIEL J. POWELL (State Bar No. 230304)
 3 AMY C. TOVAR (State Bar No. 230370)
 4 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
 5 560 Mission Street
 Twenty-Seventh Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105-2907
 Telephone: (415) 512-4000
 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077

6 Attorneys for
 H&R BLOCK, INC.,
 7 H&R BLOCK SERVICES, INC.,
 H&R BLOCK ENTERPRISES, INC.,
 8 H&R BLOCK TAX SERVICES, INC.,
 BLOCK FINANCIAL CORPORATION,
 9 HRB ROYALTY, INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 **THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF**
 14 **CALIFORNIA,**

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 **H&R BLOCK, INC., a foreign**
 18 **corporation; H&R BLOCK SERVICES,**
 19 **INC., a foreign corporation; H&R**
 20 **BLOCK ENTERPRISES, INC., a**
 21 **foreign corporation; H&R BLOCK TAX**
 22 **SERVICES, INC., a foreign corporation;**
 23 **BLOCK FINANCIAL**
 24 **CORPORATION, a foreign**
corporation; HRB ROYALTY, INC., a
foreign corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

25 Defendants.

CASE NO. C 06 2058 SC

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~—
ORDER EXTENDING (1) TIME FOR
PLAINTIFF TO MOVE TO REMAND AND
(2) TIME WITHIN WHICH DEFENDANTS
MAY ANSWER OR OTHERWISE
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT

(San Francisco Superior Court Case No.
 CGC-06-449461)

1 THE PARTIES HERETO, BY AND THROUGH THEIR UNDERSIGNED
2 COUNSEL, HEREBY STIPULATE AND AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

3 WHEREAS Plaintiff filed his Complaint in this action in San Francisco Superior
4 Court on February 15, 2006;

5
6 WHEREAS Defendants removed this action to U.S. District Court for the
7 Northern District of California on March 17, 2006;

8
9 WHEREAS Plaintiff anticipates opposing Defendants' removal to federal court by
10 filing a motion to remand;

11 WHEREAS the parties have stipulated that Plaintiff may have an additional thirty
12 (30) days beyond the time set forth in 28 U.S.C. sec. 1447(c) to file his motion to remand for a
13 total of sixty (60) days (hereinafter, the "initial period");

14
15 WHEREAS the parties have stipulated to extend the time for Defendants'
16 response to the Complaint until (A) thirty (30) days after Plaintiff's proposed motion to remand
17 has been decided by the U.S. District Court; or (B) thirty (30) days after Plaintiff requests such
18 response, notice of which may be served on Defendants no earlier than (i) thirty (30) days after
19 Plaintiff moves to remand, if Plaintiff files such a motion during the initial period, or (ii) the date
20 of removal, if Plaintiff elects not to file such a motion during the initial period and informs
21 Defendants of that election;

22
23
24 WHEREAS the parties desire to establish a mutually convenient briefing schedule
25 that will allow them to adequately brief the issues for the Court and to provide the Court with
26 adequate time to consider the papers submitted by the parties;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED that the time for Plaintiff to file his motion to remand, and for Defendants to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's complaint will be extended as set forth above.

DATED: 3/21/06

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON, LLP

By: /s/ Jeffrey L. Bleich

JEFFREY L. BLEICH
DANIEL J. POWELL (State Bar No. 230304)
AMY C. TOVAR (State Bar No. 230370)
Counsel for Defendants,
H&R BLOCK, INC.,
H&R BLOCK SERVICES, INC.,
H&R BLOCK ENTERPRISES, INC.,
H&R BLOCK TAX SERVICES, INC.,
BLOCK FINANCIAL CORPORATION,
HRB ROYALTY, INC.

DATED: 3/21/06

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF CALIFORNIA

By: /s/ Seth E. Mermin

SETH E. MERMIN
Counsel for Plaintiff,
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 3/22/06

3
HONORABLE JUDGE SAMUEL CONTI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA
IT IS SO ORDERED
Samuel Conti
Judge Samuel Conti

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING (1) TIME FOR PLAINTIFF TO MOVE TO REMAND AND (2) TIME WITHIN WHICH DEFENDANTS MAY ANSWER OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT.