

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MMCA GROUP, LTD., a Virginia corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, a
Delaware corporation, PINKERTON
CONSULTING & INVESTIGATIONS, INC., a
Delaware corporation; BUSINESS RISKS
INTERNATIONAL, LIMITED, an United
Kingdom corporation, d/b/a PINKERTON
CONSULTING & INVESTIGATIONS –
EUROPE, PICA, an Ohio corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C06-7067MMC (EMC)

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT HEWLETT-PACKARD
COMPANY'S ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME FOR
CONSIDERATION OF ITS MOTION TO
EXCLUDE THE TESTIMONY OF
PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGES EXPERT,
RANDY SUGARMAN

[Civ. L.R. 6-3, 7-11]

[No Hearing Required]

Place: Courtroom 7, Floor 19
Judge: Hon. Maxine M. Chesney

1 Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“HP”) has filed an Administrative Motion for an
2 Order to Shorten Time for Consideration of its Motion to Exclude the Testimony of Plaintiff MMCA
3 Group Ltd.’s Damages Expert, Randy Sugarman (“Motion to Exclude”).

4 This Court may grant a motion to shorten time where the moving party identifies “the
5 substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court did not change the time.” Civ. L.R. 6-
6 3(a)(3). The Court, having considered the Administrative Motion to Shorten Time and the
7 Declaration of Samuel Liversidge in support thereof, finds good cause has been shown to shorten
8 time. On December 11, 2009, the Court continued the pretrial and trial dates in this matter, so that
9 HP could depose Mr. Sugarman and file its Motion to Exclude, with adequate time for this Court to
10 consider the matter before the pretrial conference. Due to Mr. Sugarman’s personal circumstances,
11 HP was unable to take his deposition until January 7, 2010. HP filed its Motion to Exclude one week
12 later, January 15, 2010. If HP’s Motion to Exclude were to be heard according to the regular 35-day
13 schedule, it would not be heard until February 19, 2010, which is three days after the scheduled
14 pretrial conference in this case.

15 IT IS ORDERED that HP’s Administrative Motion to Shorten Time for Consideration of its
16 Motion to Exclude is therefore GRANTED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

18 1. The hearing on HP’s Motion to Exclude shall be placed on calendar for February 12,
19 2010, at 9:00 a.m. The dates on which the opposition and reply are due remain as though the
20 matter were to be heard on February 19, 2010.

21 ~~OR ALTERNATIVELY:~~


22 ~~IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:~~

23 ~~1. The pretrial conference in this matter shall be continued to _____, 2010, at
3:00 p.m.~~

24 ~~2. The trial in this matter shall be continued to _____, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.~~

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: January 21, 2010

27 
28 Hon. Maxine M. Chesney
United States District Court Judge