

1 FANIA E. DAVIS, Esq., SBN: 87268
 4100 Redwood Road #371
 2 Oakland, California 94619
 Telephone: 510.451.0104 Ext. 2
 3 Facsimile: 510.451.5056
 Email: faniad@earthlink.net

4 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 5 WAITHIRA NJENGA

6 John A. Shupe, Esq., SBN 87716
 Eric. K. Shieu, Esq., SBN 156167
 7 SHUPE AND FINKELSTEIN
 177 Bovet Road, Suite 600
 8 San Mateo, CA 94402
 Telephone: 650.341.3693
 9 Facsimile: 650.341.1395

10 Attorneys for Defendants
 SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT
 11 OF SCHOOLS, JEAN HOLBROOK, JEANNIE
 BOSLEY, CAROL PEX

12
 13
 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16
 17
 18

19 WAITHIRA NJENGA,
 20 Plaintiff,
 21 vs.

22 SAN MATEO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT
 23 OF SCHOOLS; JEAN HOLBROOK, In Her
 Individual and Official Capacities; JEANNIE
 24 BOSLEY, In Her Individual and Official
 Capacities; CAROL PEX, In Her Individual
 25 And Official Capacities; and DOES 1
 26 THROUGH 10,
 27 Defendants.
 28

Case No: C08-04019 EDL

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER TO MODIFY CASE
 MANAGEMENT ORDER**

[FRCP 16(b)(4)]

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), Plaintiff Waithira Njenga and
2 Defendants San Mateo County Superintendent of Schools, Jeannie Bosley, and Jean Holbrook
3 hereby stipulate as follows:

4 WHEREAS, the parties enter into this stipulation to extend lay and expert discovery
5 deadlines for good cause shown; and

6 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court's May 15, 2009 Order Following Further Case
7 Management Conference (and at the stipulated request of the parties), lay discovery cutoff was
8 extended to June 5, 2009, dispositive motions filing cut-off to June 23, 2009, initial expert
9 disclosures to August 11, 2009, expert discovery cut-off to September 8, 2009, with pretrial
10 conference and trial remaining scheduled on October 20, 2009 and November 9, 2009; and

11 WHEREAS, since the recent Further Case Management Conference, the parties have met
12 and conferred and come to partial agreement about a discovery dispute, exchanged nearly 2000
13 pages of documents, engaged in five depositions, and submitted part of a remaining discovery
14 dispute to the Court for in camera review; and

15 WHEREAS, there remains a discovery dispute about the discoverability of information
16 related to legal claims of discrimination against Defendants still to be resolved; and

17 WHEREAS, Plaintiff has begun but is unable to complete the depositions of Defendants
18 until completion of the Court's in camera review; and

19 WHEREAS, the parties experienced delays in locating approximately four additional
20 witnesses whose depositions still need to be taken; and

21 WHEREAS, there was a delay in completing the last three hours of Plaintiff's deposition
22 because of clerical error and because of Plaintiff's mental health status which remains delicate;
23 and
24

25 WHEREAS, it has become clear to the parties that, despite diligent efforts, their
26 stipulated request to extend lay discovery to June 5, 2009 (rather selecting the later dates and
27 time frame so graciously offered by the Court at the time), was based upon an overly optimistic
28 assessment; and

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