

1 Galia A. Phillips
 2 Stanford Law School
 3 Criminal Defense Clinic
 4 State Bar No. 250551
 5 559 Nathan Abbott Way
 6 Stanford, CA 94305
 7 Telephone: (650) 724-6345
 8 Facsimile: (650) 723-4426
 9 gphillips@law.stanford.edu
 10 *Attorney For Petitioner*

11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

<p>QUINN MALCOLM WILRIDGE,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>JOHN MARSHALL, Warden,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respondent.</p>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

C 09-2236 SI (pr)
**STIPULATION AND [~~PROPOSED~~]
 ORDER REGARDING DATE FOR
 EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER REGARDING DATE FOR
 EVIDENTIARY HEARING

Petitioner’s expert, Dr. Pablo Stewart, is on a pre-planned vacation on July 18, 2014, the date on which this Court set the evidentiary hearing on equitable tolling. The parties therefore jointly request that the Court set the evidentiary hearing on August 29, 2014 at 9:00am. The parties also jointly request that the briefing schedule be modified as follows: Petitioner’s brief

1 due on June 16, 2014; respondent's brief due on July 14, 2014; petitioner's reply brief due on
2 August 11, 2014.¹

3
4 Dated: May 8, 2014


5
6 By: /s/ Galia Amram Phillips
7 GALIA A. PHILLIPS
8 Attorney for Petitioner
9 QUINN MALCOLM WILRIDGE

10 By: /s/ Jill Thayer
11 JILL THAYER
12 Deputy Attorney General
13 Attorney for Respondent
14 JOHN MARSHALL

15
16 **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

17
18 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the evidentiary hearing on equitable tolling is continued
19 to ~~August 29, 2014~~ ^{September 3, 2014} at 9:0am. Petitioner's brief is due on June 16, 2014; respondent's brief is due
20 on July 14, 2014; petitioner's reply brief is due on August 11, 2014.

21 Dated: May 9, 2014

22
23 By: 
24 HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

26
27 ¹ The length between the response and the reply brief is due to the fact that respondent
28 may not be able to turn over its expert report until after petitioner's opening brief is due. If so,
petitioner will respond to the expert report in its reply brief.