

1 PATRICK K. FAULKNER, COUNTY COUNSEL  
 Stephen Raab, SBN 180939  
 2 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 275  
 San Rafael, CA 94903  
 3 Tel.: (415) 499-6117, Fax: (415) 499-3796

4 Attorney(s) for the County of Marin,

5  
 6 David M. Poore, SBN 192541  
 KAHN BROWN & POORE LLP  
 7 110 Kentucky Street  
 Petaluma, California 94952  
 8 Telephone: (707) 763-7100  
 Facsimile: (707) 763-7180  
 9 dpoore@kahnbrownlaw.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
 Barbara Kob

11  
 12  
 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 14 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15  
 16 Barbara Kob,

Case No.: USDC 07 2211 JL

17  
 18 Plaintiff,

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER  
 TO CONTINUE THE TRIAL DATE AND  
 ALL CORRESPONDING DEADLINES

19 v.

20 County of Marin; and DOES 1 through 50,

Hon. James Larson

21  
 22 Defendant.

23  
 24 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties to continue the presently scheduled  
 25 trial date from June 1, 2009, to a new date and time that is convenient to the Court and the parties. The  
 26 parties have also agreed to extend all corresponding deadlines, including discovery and dispositive  
 27 motion deadlines, to correspond with the new trial date. The parties are willing to participate in a  
 28 telephone conference with the Court, as necessary, to select new dates and times.

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER CONTINUING THE TRIAL DATE AND ALL  
 CORRESPONDING DEADLINES – KOB v. COUNTY OF MARIN

1 There is good cause for the stipulation to extend time as follows:

- 2 • Recent Unavailability of Lead Trial Counsel: The primary purpose of this request is the recent  
3 and unexpected unavailability of lead trial counsel for the plaintiff. In particular, plaintiff's lead  
4 trial counsel, David M. Poore, was recently assigned a courtroom for jury trial in the priority  
5 matter of *Smith v. San Juan Unified School District*, Sacramento Superior Court Case No.  
6 05AS03772, a civil action involving civil rights violations and allegations of custodial abuse of  
7 a seven-year old autistic child. The case is set for an anticipated 20-to-30 day jury trial on June  
8 16, 2009, with extensive pre-trial evidentiary hearings, including motions in limine,  
9 commencing on June 8, 2009. Furthermore, given the age of the minor and length of the trial,  
10 the trial judge has indicated that these dates are firm, and no continuances will be granted.  
11 Given these conflicts, it would be impossible for plaintiff's lead trial counsel to prepare and try  
12 these two matters almost simultaneously. The parties stipulate and agree that this trial conflict  
13 constitutes good cause to continue this matter.
- 14 • Need to Complete Fact and Expert Discovery: Good cause further exists in that the parties need  
15 additional time to conduct the necessary discovery in this case. The parties are presently  
16 completing written discovery, and will commence with deposition discovery in approximately  
17 February 2009. Given the complex nature of the pattern and practice allegations in this case, the  
18 parties do need additional time to finish fact discovery, including the necessary depositions, and  
19 retain the appropriate experts to analyze this matter and prepare the necessary reports.
- 20 • No Prior Trial Continuance Requests: The parties have not made any prior requests for a  
21 continuance of the trial in this matter.
- 22 • Judicial Economy and No Prejudice: The parties are not making this request for any improper  
23 purpose, including undue delay. Instead, the parties agree that judicial economy will be served  
24 if this request is granted. In particular, allowing additional time will limit unnecessary motion  
25 practice for discovery disputes that can be informally resolved through the meet and confer  
26 process; provide the parties with additional time to carefully prepare the case for trial and reach  
27 necessary stipulations regarding documents and potentially expected testimony; and avoid  
28 unnecessary conflicts between the pending *Smith* matter above and the trial of this matter.

1           Moreover, neither party would suffer any prejudice if the trial date was continued; instead, the  
2           parties have stipulated to this request.

3           SO STIPULATED.

4

5           Dated: January 12, 2009

6

PATRICK K. FAULKNER  
COUNTY COUNSEL

7

8

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Stephen R. Raab  
Deputy County Counsel

9

10

11

12           Dated: March 12, 2009

KAHN BROWN & POORE LLP

13

14

15

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/

16

David M. Poore  
Attorney for Plaintiff

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**PROPOSED ORDER**

THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

The parties' request to continue the trial date is GRANTED. The presently set jury trial date on June 1, 2009, and all corresponding deadlines are hereby VACATED.

The parties request to continue all corresponding deadlines, including discovery and dispositive motion deadlines, to coincide with the new jury trial date is GRANTED.

The parties are ordered to appear at a Further Case Management Conference/~~Telephone~~ ~~Conference~~ on April 22, 2009, at 10:30 a.m./~~p.m.~~ to set a trial date and new deadlines.

SO ORDERED

DATED: March 17, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JAMES LARSON

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