Case3:09-cv-01579-JSW Document12 Filed07/01/09 Page1 of 4

	Case3:09-cv-01579-JSW Document1	2 Filed07/01/09	Page1 of 4
1	JEFFREY F. KELLER (CA SBN 148005)		
2	jfkeller@kellergrover.com DENISE L. DÍAZ (CA SBN 159516)		
3	ddíaz@kellergrover.com CAREY G. BEEN (CA SBN 240996)		
4	cbeen@kellergrover.com KELLER GROVER LLP		
5	425 Second Street, Suite 500 San Francisco, CA 94107		
6	Telephone: 415.543.1305 Facsimile: 415.543.7861		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8	GEORGE T. BURKE		
9	JAMES R. McGUIRE (CA SBN 189275) JMcGuire@mofo.com		
10	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP		
11	425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482		
12	Telephone: 415.268.7000 Facsimile: 415.268.7522		
13	SYLVIA RIVERA (CA SBN 223203)		
14	SRivera@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP		
15	555 West Fifth Street Los Angeles, CA 90013-1024		
16	Telephone: 213.892.5200 Facsimile: 213.892.5454		
17	Attorneys for Defendants		
18	U.S. BANCORP and U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION		
19			
20	UNITED STATES DIST		
21	NORTHERN DISTRICT (OF CALIFORNIA	
22	CEODCE T DUDVE on behalf of himself and all	Case No. CV 09 1:	570 ICW
23	GEORGE T. BURKE, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,		3/9 33 W
24	Plaintiff,	CLASS ACTION	AND IDDODOSEDŁ
25	v.	ORDER FOR FU	AND [PROPOSED] URTHER EXTENSION
26	U.S. BANCORP, U.S. BANK N.A., and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	OF TIME TO RESPOND TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT IN LIGHT OF ANTICIPATED FILING OF	
27			DED COMPLAINT
28	Defendants.	_	
	STIP. TO FURTHER EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO FAC		Case No. CV 09 1579 JSW
	la-1035222		

Pursuant to Local Rule 6-1(a) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a), Plaintiff George T. Burke ("Plaintiff") and Defendants U.S. Bancorp and U.S. Bank National Association ("Defendants"), by and through their respective attorneys, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed his complaint in this matter on February 6, 2009;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed the First Amended Complaint in this matter on March 10, 2009;

WHEREAS, Defendants removed this case from California State Superior Court on April 10, 2009;

WHEREAS, the parties have since engaged in mutual discussion and an informal exchange of information regarding the conduct at issue in this litigation;

WHEREAS, as a result of such discussions Plaintiff and Defendants agreed that Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint may not accurately allege certain facts and Defendants' policies and procedures;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff decided that under the circumstances, amendment of the First Amended Complaint would be appropriate;

WHEREAS, in the process of preparing a second amended complaint, Plaintiff discovered that another putative class action, commenced after this action, existed in the Central District of California regarding substantially the same subject matter as the instant litigation, specifically the case of *Lowe, et al. v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, case no. SACV 09-0456 AG (the "*Lowe* Action");

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff and counsel for the plaintiffs in the *Lowe* Action have now prepared a draft consolidated Second Amended Complaint, which they propose to file in this Court, the court before which the first-filed action is pending, in an effort to avoid duplicative litigation and conserve judicial resources;

WHEREAS, on June 30, 2009 (yesterday), counsel for Plaintiff provided to counsel for Defendants (i) a copy of the proposed, consolidated Second Amended Complaint and (ii) a proposed stipulation consenting to the filing of the Second Amended Complaint;

Case3:09-cv-01579-JSW Document12 Filed07/01/09 Page3 of 4

WHEREAS, counsel for Defendants have not had an adequate opportunity to fully review the proposed Second Amended Complaint with the relevant personnel from Defendants, but expect to complete that process soon; WHEREAS, the parties remain hopeful that at the conclusion of that process, they will reach a stipulation regarding the filing of a second amended complaint, thus obviating the need for any motion practice concerning the filing of a second amended complaint; and WHEREAS, in light of the foregoing, the parties agree that Defendants' deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint, which is currently July 1, 2009, should be extended an additional two weeks to allow the parties to reach a stipulation regarding the filing of a second amended complaint; IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED pursuant to Local Rule 6-1(a), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a), by and between Plaintiff George Burke and Defendants U.S. Bancorp and U.S. Bank National Association, through their respective attorneys, that the time by which Defendants may plead or otherwise respond to the First Amended Complaint shall be extended to and include Wednesday, July 15, 2009.

Case3:09-cv-01579-JSW Document12 Filed07/01/09 Page4 of 4

Dated: July 1, 2009 JEFFREY F. KELLER		
	REY G. BEEN LLER GROVER LLP	
KE.	LLER GROVER LLI	
	// G	
·	/s/ Carey G. Been Carey G. Been	
	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
	GEORGE T. BURKE	
Dated: July 1, 2009 JAN	MES R. MCGUIRE	
SYI	LVIA RIVERA ORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	
MIC	TRRISON & FUERSTER LLP	
·	/s/ James R. McGuire James R. McGuire	
Attorneys for Defendants U.S. BANCORP and U.S. BANK		
	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION	
GENERAL ORDER 45 ATTESTATION		
In accordance with General Order 45, concurrence in the filing of this document has been		
obtained from each of the signatories and I shall maintain records to support this concurrence for		
subsequent production for the court if so ordered or for inspection upon request by a party.		
_	James R. McGuire	
	Attorneys for Defendants U.S. BANCORP and U.S. BANK	
	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION	
PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
	0.11	
Dated: July 2, 2009 By:	My Swhite	
	Judge Jaffrey J. White United States District Court Judge	
STIP. TO FURTHER EXTEND TIME TO	Coso No. CV 00 1570 ISW	
	Dated: July 1, 2009 GENERAL ORDER 45 In accordance with General Order 45, concurrence is obtained from each of the signatories and I shall massubsequent production for the court if so ordered or PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORIDated: July 2, 2009 By:	

RESPOND TO FAC la-1035222