	Judge:	Hon. Samuel Conti			
JANI-KING OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a Texas Corporation, et al., Defendants.	Date: Time: Courtroom:	February 24, 2012 10:00 am 1, 17 th Flr.			
Plaintiffs, v.	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF MOTION				
ALEJANDRO JUAREZ, et al.,	Case No.: CV09-0	03495 SC			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
(ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON LAST PAGE)					
Attorneys for Plaintiffs					
Telephone:(415) 433-0333 Facsimile: (415) 449-6556					
235 Montgomery St., Suite 1010 San Francisco, CA 94104					
(monique@dplolaw.com) DUCKWORTH PETERS LEBOWITZ OLI	VIER LLP				
MONIQUE OLIVIER (SBN 190385)					
Telephone: (415) 989-8000 Facsimile: (415) 989-8028					
170 Columbus Avenue, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94133					
(jennifer@e-licenciados.com) TALAMANTES/VILLEGAS/CARRERA, I	IP				
(mark@e-licenciados.com) JENNIFER A. REISCH (SBN 223671)					
MARK TALAMANTES (SBN 187961)					
Telephone: (415) 477-2410					
354 Pine Street, Fourth Floor					
THE STURDEVANT LAW FIRM					
A Professional Corporation 354 Pine Street, Fourth Floor San Francisco, CA 94104					

1	Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12, Plaintiffs Alejandro Juarez, Maria Juarez, and				
2	Maria Portillo ("Plaintiffs") and Defendants Jani-King of California, Inc., Jani-King, Inc., and Jani-				
3	King International, Inc. ("Defendants"), hereby state as follows:				
4	1. The trial in this matter is scheduled for March 12, 2012.				
5	2. On January 23, 2012, the Court issued an order that, among other rulings, granted				
6	summary judgment against the claims brought under the California Labor Code (Counts 8-13). (Dkt.				
7	168).				
8	3. On February 1, 2012, the Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Certification Pursuant to 28				
9	U.S.C. § 1292(b) and to Stay Further Proceedings Pending Appeal. (Dkt. 176). In that motion,				
10	Plaintiffs seek certification for an interlocutory appeal to the Ninth Circuit regarding the proper				
11	standard to be applied to Labor Code claims that are brought by alleged franchisees.				
12	4. Based on consultations with the Court's clerk, the soonest hearing date under N.D.				
13	Civ. L.R. 7-2(a) is March 9, 2012, which is two business days before the scheduled trial.				
14	(Declaration of Monique Olivier ("Olivier Decl."), Exh. A).				
15	5. The parties will need to spend considerable resources prior to March 9 to get ready				
16	for trial on March 12, including scheduling and preparing witnesses, reviewing voluminous				
17	deposition transcripts and documents, identifying and preparing exhibits, briefing motions in limine				
18	and other trial matters, drafting jury instructions, preparing opening statements, etc. (Olivier Decl.).				
19	6. Given the benefits of obtaining a ruling on the Plaintiffs' motion on a more expedited				
20	basis, the parties have agreed to shorten the normal motion schedule and to waive oral argument.				
21	Defendant has agreed to file its opposition on or before February 13, 2012.				
22	7. Through consultation with the Court's clerk, counsel were advised that an earlier				
23	hearing date was available on February 24, 2012, if permitted by the Court. (Olivier Decl.). As a				
24	result, the parties are scheduling a hearing for that date in the event the Court rules that a hearing is				
25	necessary.				
26	8. A proposed order is included below.				
27					
28					

1	DATED: February 3, 2012		Respectfully submitted,		
2			THE STURDEVANT LAW FIRM A Professional Corporation		
3			TALAMANTES/VILLEGAS/CARRERA, LLP		
4			DUCKWORTH PETERS LEBOWITZ		
5			OLIVIER LLP		
6			LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.		
7 8		By:	<u>/s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan</u> Shannon Liss-Riordan		
0 9			Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
9			FAEGRE & BENSON, LLP		
10		By:	<u>/s/ Eileen M. Hunter</u> Eileen M. Hunter Kerry L. Bundy		
12			Aaron von Oort Attorneys for Defendants		
13			BARTKO, ZANKEL, TARRANT & MILLER		
14		By:	/s/ Benjamin K. Riley		
15		J	Benjamin K. Riley Attorneys for Defendants		
16					
17	[PROPOSED] ORDER				
18	Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the Plaintiffs' motion for certification and to stay (Dkt.				
19	176) will be heard on an expedited basis and without oral argument.				
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.		lame wate		
21	Dated: February 3, 2012	The H	Ionorable Samuel Conti		
22			ED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
		2			
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF MOTION; CASE NO. CV 09-03495 SC				