The Wilderness So	ciety et al v. United	d States Departmer	nt of Interior et al

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
The Wilderness Soc'y, et al., NO. C 09-03048 JW				
Plaintiffs, ORDER GRANTING IN PART PARTIES'				
STAY OF PROCEEDINGS				
/				
Presently before the Court is a Stipulation of the Parties Further Extending Stay of				
Proceedings. (hereafter, "Stipulation," Docket Item No. 50.) The Court has issued five Orders in				
this case extending the stay of proceedings that has been in place since September 28, 2009. ¹				
The parties seek to extend the most recent extension of the stay, which expired on March 1, 2011,				
for an additional 150 days. (Stipulation at 1.)				
Upon review, the Court finds good cause to extend the stay for purposes of completing a				
settlement between the parties. ² However, as this case has been stayed for over two years, the Court				
finds that an extended stay is no longer effective.				
¹ (See Docket Item Nos. 24, 27, 33, 36, 42 and 44.)				
² On April 28, 2011, Intervenor-Defendants filed a Response to the parties' Stipulation				
discussions without their involvement. (See Docket Item No. 51.) Thus, the parties shall make				
those discussions implicate the interests of Intervenor-Defendants.				
	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION The Wilderness Soc'y, et al., NO. C 09-03048 JW Plaintiffs, ORDER GRANTING IN PART PARTIES' v. STIPULATION FURTHER EXTENDING STAY OF PROCEEDINGS United States Dep't of Interior, et al., 			

1	Accordingly, the Court GRANTS in part the parties' Stipulation as follows:			
2	(1)	The stay of proceedings is extended until June 20, 2011;		
3	(2)	On June 20, 2011 at 10 a.m., the Court will conduct a Status Conference re:		
4		Settlement.		
5	(3)	On or before June 10, 2011, the parties shall file a Joint Status Conference Statement		
6		which provides the Court with an update on settlement discussions including whether		
7		the parties have reached an agreement. If an agreement has not been reached the		
8		parties shall include in their Statement a good faith proposed schedule as to how this		
9		case should proceed.		
10		\circ		
11	Dated: May 2	2, 2011 James Mare		
12		JAMES WARE United States District Chief Judge		
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28		2		

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THI	S ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:
2	Amy Rae Atwood atwood@biologicaldiversity.org David Bernard Glazer david glazer@usdoi gov	
3	David Bernard Glazer david.glazer@usdoj.gov David Bernard Glazer david.glazer@usdoj.gov David Bernard Glazer david.glazer@usdoj.gov	
4	Gregory C. Loarie gloarie@earthjustice.org Gregory C. Loarie gloarie@earthjustice.org	
5	J. Michael Klise jmklise@crowell.com James Stuart Angell jangell@earthjustice.org	
6	Meredith L. Flax Meredith.Flax@usdoj.gov	
7	Dated: May 2, 2011	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
8		0,
9		By: /s/ JW Chambers Susan Imbriani
10		Courtroom Deputy
11 12		
12		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		