

Thomas Marc Litton (CA Bar # 119985)
 SANFORD WITTELS & HEISLER, LLP
 120 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 421-4770
 Facsimile: (415) 421-4784

Steven L. Wittels
 SANFORD WITTELS & HEISLER, LLP
 950 Third Avenue, 10th Floor
 New York, New York 10022
 Telephone: (646) 723-2947
 Facsimile: (646) 723-2948
 swittels@nydclaw.com
Pending Pro Hac Vice Admission

Attorneys for Plaintiff Eric Baker

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ERIC JAMES BAKER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COUNTY OF SONOMA; SONOMA COUNTY
 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; BILL COGBILL;
 CALIFORNIA FORENSIC MEDICAL
 GROUP, INC.; JAMES LUDERS, M.D.;
 LEWIS LINCOLN; DANIEL CORTEZ;
 EDUARDO ESPINO; and DOES 1 through 10,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:08-cv-03433-EDL

ECF Case

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER RE CASE DEADLINES**

Hon. Elizabeth Laporte

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the undersigned
 counsel for all parties, that subject to the Court's approval, the return date and briefing

schedule on the following motion of the parties, and initial Case Management Conference, shall be as follows:

I. County Defendants' Motion to Dismiss

1. Plaintiff's response to the motion to dismiss filed by Defendants County of Sonoma, Sonoma County Sheriff's Department, Bill Cogbill, Lewis Lincoln, Daniel Cortez, and Eduardo Espino (the "County Defendants") shall be served by December 30, 2008.
2. The County Defendants' reply in support of their 12b(6) motion to dismiss shall be served by January 13, 2008.
3. The Return Date and Hearing on County Defendants' 12b(6) motion to dismiss are adjourned until January 27, 2008 at ^{2:00pm}~~9:00 a.m.~~ before the Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte.

II. Initial Case Management Conference

1. The Initial Case Management Conference scheduled for December 16, 2008 is adjourned until January 27, 2008, directly following the hearing on Defendants' Motions to Dismiss scheduled for January 27, 2008.
2. The Joint Case Management Statement will be due one week prior to the adjourned conference date, on January 20, 2008.

The reason for these requests is that Plaintiff's counsel is currently in the midst of briefing multiple cases under prior court Orders, and requires this additional time to respond to Defendants' 12(b)(6) motion.

