

1 **BARROWAY TOPAZ KESSLER**  
 2 **MELTZER & CHECK, LLP**

3 Peter A. Muhic  
 4 Robert W. Biela  
 5 James A. Maro  
 6 280 King of Prussia Road  
 7 Radnor, PA 19087  
 8 Telephone: (610) 667-7706  
 9 Facsimile: (610) 667-7056

10 -and-

11 **BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER &**  
 12 **BIRKHAUSER, LLP**

13 Alan R. Plutzik (Cal. Bar No. 077785)  
 14 L. Timothy Fisher (Cal. Bar No. 191626)  
 15 2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 120  
 16 Walnut Creek, California 94598  
 17 Telephone: (925) 945-0200  
 18 Facsimile: (925-945-8792

19 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

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

22 PAUL VELASQUEZ, FAVIOLA ALVAREZ,  
 23 MARCELO ALTAMIRANO, JACKEY  
 24 WILSON II, CARLOS MARTINEZ AND  
 25 DIONICIO MARTINEZ on behalf of  
 26 themselves and all others similarly situated,

27 Plaintiffs,

28 v.

29 HSBC FINANCE CORPORATION;  
 30 HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION;  
 31 BENEFICIAL COMPANY LLC,

32 Defendants.

CASE NO. C08-04592 SC

**PARTIES' STIPULATION AND**  
**[PROPOSED] REVISED**  
**PRETRIAL SCHEDULING**  
**ORDER**

33 THIS STIPULATION AND PROPOSED REVISED PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER  
 34 is made by and entered into between Defendants HSBC Finance Corporation and Beneficial  
 35 Company LLC (collectively, "Defendants") and Plaintiffs Marcelo Altamirano and Jackey Wilson II  
 36 (collectively, "Plaintiffs"). Plaintiffs seek to pursue this action as a nationwide collective action on  
 37

1 behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated former Account Executives who were employed  
2 by Defendants. Plaintiffs also seek to pursue this action as a California state class action on behalf  
3 of themselves and all other current and former Account Executives who were employed by  
4 Defendants in the State of California.

5 WHEREAS, on January 25, 2010, counsel for Defendants (Seyfarth Shaw) notified counsel  
6 for Plaintiffs that they would no longer be representing Defendants in this matter;

7 WHEREAS, on January 29, 2010, counsel for Defendants, Seyfarth Shaw, was withdrawn  
8 and was superseded as defense counsel by the law firm of Littler Mendelson (Docket No. 106);

9 WHEREAS, significant class-based discovery remains to be completed, including, *inter alia*,  
10 the anticipated supplementation of Defendants' discovery responses as well as additional depositions  
11 of certain of Defendants' witnesses;

12 WHEREAS, prior to the change in defense counsel, the parties had been continuing their  
13 dialogue concerning outstanding discovery issues—particularly as they pertain to discovery  
14 concerning Defendants' California branches;

15 WHEREAS, recognizing the remaining discovery required to be produced by Defendant, the  
16 parties stipulated to, and on January 5, 2010 the Court entered an Order granting a 45-day extension  
17 of the deadlines in the then current case management schedule (Docket No. 99);

18 WHEREAS, on January 25, 2010, in light of ongoing unresolved discovery disputes, the  
19 parties were preparing to submit their second jointly-filed letter to the Honorable Magistrate Judge  
20 Maria-Elena James pursuant to Magistrate Judge James' Standing Order Re: Discovery and Dispute  
21 Procedures for Cases Assigned or Referred to Magistrate Judge Maria-Elena James;

22 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs agreed to defer submitting the second joint-letter to Magistrate Judge  
23 James until new defense counsel has had adequate time to receive and review the file materials from  
24 Seyfarth Shaw and familiarize themselves with the current state of discovery;

25 WHEREAS, due to the extent of outstanding discovery which Defendant is in the process of  
26 locating, reviewing and producing to Plaintiffs, in addition to the time Littler Mendelson will require  
27 to become fully familiar with the current litigation, the dates set forth in the current case

28

1 management schedule cannot reasonably be met;

2 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
3 Procedure 23 is currently due to be filed on or before February 26, 2010;

4 WHEREAS, Defendants' Opposition to Class Certification is currently due to be filed by  
5 April 16, 2010;

6 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of Class Certification is currently due to be  
7 filed by May 17, 2010;

8 WHEREAS, the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification is currently scheduled  
9 for June 25, 2010;

10 WHEREAS, the parties have conferred and believe that an approximate four-month  
11 extension of the above dates as set forth in the current scheduling Order entered on January 5, 2010  
12 is reasonable and necessary to provide the parties with the time necessary to conclude class  
13 discovery prior to briefing class certification;

14 WHEREFORE, IT IS NOW HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED that:

15 1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification pursuant to Rule 23 shall be filed by June  
16 25, 2010;

17 2. Defendants' Opposition to Class Certification shall be filed by July 26, 2010;

18 3. Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of Class Certification shall be filed by August  
19 25, 2010;

20 4. The hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification shall be conducted on  
21 September 10, 2010 or such other date as ordered by the Court; and

22 5. Within fifteen (15) days of a ruling by the Court regarding Plaintiffs' Motion for  
23 Class Certification, the parties shall meet and confer and jointly submit to the Court a status report  
24 regarding their plans for participation in a Court-mandated ADR program and address any other  
25 outstanding issues including how much, if any, additional discovery is required; and

26 6. In light of the recent substitution of defense counsel, the parties request that the Court  
27 schedule a case management conference at the Court's earliest convenience to enable the parties to  
28

1 more fully apprise the Court of the current state of the litigation and to set forth a schedule moving  
2 forward.

3

4 **SO STIPULATED**

5

Dated: February 16, 2010

6

**BARROWAY TOPAZ KESSLER  
MELTZER & CHECK, LLP**

7

By: /s/ Peter A. Muhic

8

Peter A. Muhic  
Robert W. Biela  
James A. Maro

9

280 King of Prussia Road  
Radnor, PA 19087  
Telephone: (610) 667-7706  
Facsimile: (610) 667-7056

10

11

12

-and-

13

**BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER &  
BIRKHAUSER, LLP**

14

Alan R. Plutzik (Bar No. 077785)  
L. Timothy Fisher (Bar No. 191626)  
2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 120  
Walnut Creek, CA 94598  
Telephone: (925) 945-0770  
Facsimile: (925) 945-8792

15

16

17

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

18

19

**LITTLER MENDELSON**

20

By: /s/ Michelle R. Barrett

21

Sofia Anderson  
George J. Tichy, II  
Michael F. McCabe  
Michelle R. Barrett  
650 California Street, 20th Fl.  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
Telephone: (415) 433-1940  
Facsimile: (415) 399-8490

22

23

24

25

*Counsel for Defendants*

26

27

28

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 PAUL VELASQUEZ, FAVIOLA ALVAREZ,  
5 MARCELO ALTAMIRANO, JACKEY  
6 WILSON II, CARLOS MARTINEZ AND  
7 DIONICIO MARTINEZ on behalf of  
8 themselves and all others similarly situated,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 HSBC FINANCE CORPORATION;  
12 HOUSEHOLD FINANCE CORPORATION;  
13 BENEFICIAL COMPANY LLC,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C08-04592 SC

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER  
GRANTING PARTIES'  
STIPULATION AND REVISED  
PRETRIAL SCHEDULING  
ORDER

15 The Court having read and reviewed the parties' Stipulation and [Proposed] Revised Pretrial  
16 Scheduling Order rules as follows:

17 1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification pursuant to Rule 23 shall be filed by June  
18 25, 2010;

19 2. Defendants' Opposition to Class Certification shall be filed by July 26, 2010;

20 3. Plaintiffs' Reply in Further Support of Class Certification shall be filed by August  
21 25, 2010;

22 4. The hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification shall be conducted on  
23 September 17, 2010 or such other date as ordered by the Court; and

24 5. Within fifteen (15) days of a ruling by the Court regarding Plaintiffs' Motion for  
25 Class Certification, the parties shall meet and confer and jointly submit to the Court a status report  
26 regarding their plans for participation in a Court-mandated ADR program and address any other  
27 outstanding issues including how much, if any, additional discovery is required; and

28 6. ~~At the parties' request, and in light of the recent substitution of defense counsel, the~~  
~~Court schedules an in-person case management conference on \_\_\_\_\_, 2010 to~~

1 more fully discuss the progress of the case and other scheduling or discovery matters.

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

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: 2/16/10

Honorable  
United States

