Continental D.I.A	Diamond Products, Inc. v. Dong Young Diamond Inc. Case3:08-cv-02136-SI Document14		Doc. 149
	Cases.06-cv-02136-St Document14	Filed09/29/09 Page Fol 3	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
11	CONTINENTAL D.I.A. DIAMOND	Case No. CV 08-2136 SI	
12	PRODUCTS, INC., a California corporation,	SECOND JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR	
13	Plaintiff,	MODIFICATION OF CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE AND	
14 15	VS.	TRIAL DATE	
16	DONG YOUNG DIAMOND INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD., a South Korean company,	Judge: Honorable Susan Illsto	n
17	DONGSOO LEE, an individual, and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	Complaint Filed: April 24, 2008	
18	10, metusive,	Trial Date: February 16, 2010	
19	Defendants.		
20	AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.		
21			
22	<u>STIPULATION</u>		
23	WHEREAS, Continental D.I.A. Diamond Products, Inc. ("Continental" or "Plaintiff") and		
24	Defendants Dong Young Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd. and DongSoo Lee (collectively		
25	"Defendants") continue to engage in settlement discussions, which respective counsel believe will		
26	lead to a final resolution of this matter;		
27	WHEREAS, while the parties have made significant progress in such settlement discussions,		
28	due to the time-zone and communication challenges faced by counsel for Defendants, such		
	SECOND JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR MODIFICATION CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE AND TRIAL DATE CASE NO.: CV 08-2136 SI Dockets.Justia.com		

1	discussions are taking longer than original expected;			
2	WHEREAS, counsel for the parties believe that an additional thirty (30) day suspension of			
3	applicable deadlines in this case will allow the parties and counsel to continue to devote their			
4	attention and resources to a final resolution of this matter, and			
5	WHEREAS, the agreed upon extension of the fact and expert discovery deadlines,			
6	dispositive motion deadlines and the trial date is not for the purpose of delay, and the parties believe			
7	that this reasonable extension of time may well obviate the need for trial in this matter, and is in the			
8	interests of fairness and judicial economy.			
9	ACCORDINGLY, the parties, by and through their undersigned counsel, HEREBY			
10	STIPULATE as follows:			
11	In order to avoid prejudicing the parties' discovery efforts and trial preparations, and to			
12	allow the parties to focus on settlement negotiations, the parties agree and respectfully request that			
13	the current pre-trial schedule be modified as follows:			
14	1. The fact discovery cut-off, which is currently set for November 5, 2009, is extended			
15	to December 7, 2009;			
16	2. The deadline to designate experts, which is currently set for December 14, 2009, is			
17	extended to January 13, 2010;			
18	3. The deadline to designate rebuttal experts, which is currently set for January 7, 2010			
19	is extended to February 8, 2010; and			
20	4. The expert discovery cut-off, which is currently January 25, 2010, is extended to			
21	February 24, 2010.			
22	5. The dates for dispositive motions is extended for thirty days, to the following			
23	schedule:			
24	• Dispositive Motions Due: December 30, 2009			
25	• Oppositions Due: January 11, 2010			
26	• Replies Due: January 21, 2010			
27	6. The hearing on dispositive motions, which is currently January 15, 2010, is reset for			
28	February 15, 2010, or as soon thereafter as the Court's schedule permits.			

Case3:08-cv-02136-SI Document148 Filed09/29/09 Page3 of 3

	11		
1	7. The pretrial confer	rence, which is currently March 2, 2010, is adjourned for thirty	
2	days, to April $\frac{6}{4}$, 2010 or as soon thereafter as the Court's schedule permits.		
3	8. The trial date, which is currently March 15, 2010, is adjourned for thirty days, to		
4	April 14, 2010 or as soon thereafter as the Court's schedule permits.		
5	9. All other deadlines are tolled for 30 days as of the date of this stipulation.		
6	IT IS SO STIPULATED BY THE PARTIES.		
7	Dated: September 29, 2009	MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO P.C.	
8			
9		By: JEFFREY M. RATINOFF	
10		Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,	
11		Continental D.I.A. Diamond Products, Inc.	
12			
13	Dated: September 29, 2009	PRETI FLAHERTY BELIVEAU & PACHIOS, LLP	
14			
15		By: Alfred C. Frawley ALFRED C. FRAWLEY	
16		Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaimants,	
17		Dong Young Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd., and DongSoo Lee	
18			
19	PURSUANT TO STIPU	LATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20			
21	Dated:		
22			
23			
24		Duran Delaton	
25		THE HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
26			
27			
28	4724877v.1		
		- 3 -	

SECOND JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR MODIFICATION CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE AND TRIAL DATE CASE NO.: CV 08-2136 SI