1	Robert B. Hawk (SBN 118054) J. Christopher Mitchell (SBN 215639)	
2	HOGAN & HARTSON LLP	
3	525 University Avenue, 4 th Floor Palo Alto, California 94301	
4	Telephone: (650) 463-4000 Facsimile: (650) 463-4199	
5	rbhawk@hhlaw.com jcmitchell@hhlaw.com	
6 7	Attorneys for Defendants HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC. and HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC	
8	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
10	TINA WALTER, CHRISTOPHER BAYLESS,	CASE NO.: 09-CV-02136 SC
11	and ERIC SCHUMACHER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
12	•	ORDER REGARDING ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED
13	Plaintiffs,	CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION
14	V.	COMPLAINT
15	HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC. and HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC,	The Honorable Samuel Conti
16	Defendants.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE ANSWEI CASE NO.: 09-CV-02136 SC	8

1	WHEREAS, on October 5, 2009, Defendants Hughes Communications, Inc. and Hughes
2	Network Systems, LLC (collectively, "Hughes" or "Defendants") filed a Motion to Dismiss
3	Plaintiffs' Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint (the "Motion to Dismiss");
4	WHEREAS, on January 26, 2010, the Court issued an Order Granting in Part and Denying
5	in Part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss;
6	WHEREAS, an answer to the Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint is currently
7	due on February 9, 2010;
8	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs intend to amend their complaint in light of the Court's order, and
9	have 30 days from the date of the order in which to do so;
10	WHEREAS, in the interests of efficiency and economy, the parties agree that Defendants
11	need not file an answer to the Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint, in light of
12	Plaintiffs' intention to file an amended complaint (the "New Complaint"), and that Defendants
13	should instead file a response to the New Complaint, once it is filed;
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties through their respective		
2	counsel, that: 1) Defendants are not required to file an answer to Plaintiffs' Amended		
3	Consolidated Class Action Complaint; and 2) Defendants will answer or otherwise respond to		
4	Plaintiffs' New Complaint within 20 days of the date the New Complaint is filed.		
5	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
6	Dated: February 5, 2010 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP		
7	By: /s/		
8	Robert B. Hawk		
9	Attorneys for Defendants		
10	HUGHES COMMUNICATIONS, INC. and HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS LLC		
11			
12	Dated: February 5, 2010 AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP		
13	By: /s/ Joshua C. Ezrin		
14			
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
16	PURSUANT TO THE ABOVE STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
17			
18	STATES DISTRICT		
19	Dated: February 8, 2010		
20	THE HONOR Judge Samuel Conti		
21			
22	/// // /// // //		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	2		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE ANSWER CASE NO.: 09-CV-02136 SC		

1	I, Robert B. Hawk, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this		
2	Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Briefing Schedule for Defendants' Motion to		
3	Dismiss. In compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that Joshua Ezrin concurred		
4	in this filing.		
5			
6	DATED: February 5, 2010 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP		
7			
8	By Robert B. Hawk		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	STIPLIL ATION AND IPPOPOSEDLOPDED BE ANSWED	_	
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE ANSWER CASE NO.: 09-CV-02136 SC		