	THOMAS R. BURKE (CA State Bar No. 141930) DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP		930)	
LLP	2	One Embarcadero Center, Suite 600		
	3	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 276-6500		
	4	Facsimile: (415) 276-6599 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com		
	5	JOHN D. SEIVER (admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)		
	6	ADAM S. CALDWELL (admitted <i>Pro Hac V</i> RONALD G. LONDON (admitted <i>Pro Hac V</i>		
	7	ELIZABETH A. DROGULA (admitted <i>Pro H</i> DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP		
		1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 200		
	8	Telephone: (202) 973-4200		
	9	Facsimile: (202) 973-4499 Email: johnseiver@dwt.com		
	10	Attorneys for Defendant BRESNAN COMMUNICATIONS, INC.		
	11	[ADDITIONAL PARTIES AND COUNSEL		
	12	LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGES]		
	13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
∃MA	14	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE	15	DAN VALENTINE, et al.,	Case No. C08 05113 TEH (EMC)	
	16	Plaintiffs,		
	17	VS.	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
	18	NEBUAD, INC., et al.	ORDER RESCHEDULING INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE	
	19	Defendants.	TO A DATE THIRTY DAYS AFTER THE RESOLUTION OF THE DEFENDANTS'	
	20	2010110111101	PENDING MOTIONS TO DISMISS	
	21		Complaint Filed: November 10, 2008	
	22		Trial Date: None Set	
	23			
	24			
	25			
	26			
	27			
	28			
	20			

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

Pursuant to Local Rule 6-1, Plaintiffs and Defendants Bresnan Communications, Cable One, CenturyTel, Embarq, Knology, and WOW! (collectively, the "ISP Defendants") and Defendant NebuAd hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

- 1. This putative class action complaint proceeding was filed on November 10, 2008. That same day the Court issued an Order scheduling the Initial Case Management Conference for February 23, 2009. (DE #2) Other deadlines (including the times to "meet and confer," file an ADR certification and stipulation, file a Rule 26(f) Report, make initial disclosures, and file a Joint Case Management Statement, were set for February 2 and 16, 2009. (DE # 2)
- 2. On December 22, 2008 Defendant NebuAd filed a motion to dismiss. (DE # 4) In addition, stipulations extending the ISP Defendants' response dates and rescheduling the hearing on Defendant NebuAd's motion were filed in December and early January (DE ## 3, 7 and 8).
- 3. Thereafter, on January 6, 2009, the Clerk issued a Notice rescheduling the Initial Case Management Conference for April 6, 2009, which automatically moved the other deadlines to March 16 and 30, 2009. (DE # 9)
- 4. On January 30, ISP Defendants each filed Motions to Dismiss (DE ## 40, 44, 51, 52,) and Defendant Bresnan filed a Motion to Compel Arbitration. (DE # 42) Hearings on all motions were noticed for March 9. On February 13 Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery (DE # 64) which was noticed for hearing on March 23. Plaintiffs thereafter filed oppositions to Defendant NebuAd's and the ISP Defendants' motions, referencing their Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery (DE ## 65, 66 and 67)
- 5. The Court then stayed the Defendants' motions (DE # 70) and on February 20 referred the Plaintiffs' Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery to Magistrate Judge Edward Chen.

(DE #71) Judge Chen rescheduled the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery to March 25. (DE #72)

- 6. By Order dated March 26, 2009 (DE # 90), Judge Chen ruled that Plaintiffs may take jurisdictional discovery of Defendant NebuAd informally, which is to be completed within thirty (30) days of the Order. (DE # 90, ¶ 1) At the hearing (Judge Chen also directed that Plaintiffs may commence merits discovery of Defendant NebuAd only. (DE # # 90, ¶ 2; 94 (minute order)) Judge Chen ruled that no initial disclosures between the Plaintiffs and the ISP Defendants may be had, and no discovery against the ISP Defendants may commence, until after the court resolves the pending motions to dismiss. (DE # 90, ¶¶ 3, 5)
- 7. To that end, Judge Chen directed Plaintiffs to file their oppositions to the motions to dismiss within forty-five (45) days of the Order and that the ISP Defendants file their replies 14 days thereafter. (DE # 90, ¶ 4)
- 8. Because the Defendants' motions to dismiss and compel arbitration are being stayed pending Plaintiffs' receipt of jurisdictional discovery and the parties' completion of the briefing on the Defendants' pending motions to dismiss, which will likely extend into May, it would be unnecessary and wasteful for the parties to discuss initial disclosures, case management, ADR, and related issues, or prepare a Case Management Statement prior to the resolution of Defendants' motions to dismiss. However, unless the initial Case Management Conference is rescheduled, the parties would have to appear for the initial Case management Conference next week, well before the hearing on or resolution of the Defendants' motions to dismiss. Judge Chen urged the parties to stipulate to delaying the case management conference. (DE # 93 (transcript) at pp. 51-54)
- 9. Accordingly, the Parties hereby stipulate to rescheduling the initial Case Management Conference to a date thirty (30) days after the resolution of Defendants' motions to dismiss.