1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

24

25

26

27

28

Dated: December 15, 2009

STONEBRAE, L.P.,

9 Plaintiff, 10 v. United States District Court 11 TOLL BROS., INC., et al., For the Northern District of California 12 Defendants. 13 14 15 16 set for hearing on December 16, 2009. The Court orders the parties to be prepared to discuss the following at the December 16 hearing. 17 18 (1) 19 App. 4th 44 (2002). 20 (2) 21 such that Stonebrae could cure the default without further information or cooperation from Toll. If so, then what implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing was breached? If not, then isn't there 22 23 an implied covenant to cooperate?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA No. C-08-0221 EMC ORDER RE DECEMBER 16, 2009, HEARING Plaintiff has filed a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint ("SAC"), which is The state court decision Storek & Storek, Inc. v. Citicorp Real Estate, Inc., 100 Cal. Whether the Purchase Agreement requires a Default Notice to be sufficiently specific IT IS SO ORDERED.

EDWARD M. CHEN

United States Magistrate Judge