

THE LANIER LAW FIRM, P.C.  
W. Mark Lanier (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
wml@lanierlawfirm.com  
Christopher D. Banys SBN: 230038  
cdb@lanierlawfirm.com  
Daniel M. Shafer SBN: 244839  
dms@lanierlawfirm.com  
2200 Geng Road, Suite 200  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.322.9100  
Fax: 650.322.9103

FRANKLIN D. AZAR & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
FRANKLIN D. AZAR (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
azarf@fdazar.com  
MEGHAN MARTINEZ (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
martinezm@fdazar.com  
RICHARD P. BARKLEY (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
barkleyr@fdazar.com  
NATHAN J. AXVIG (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
axvign@fdazar.com  
14426 East Evans Avenue  
Aurora, CO 80014  
Tel: 303.757.3300  
Fax: 303.757.3206

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
Robert J. Smith, State Bar No. 162784  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
rsmith@morganlewis.com  
Melinda S. Riechert, SBN: 65504  
mriechert@morganlewis.com  
Anne M. Brafford, SBN: 237574  
abrafford@morganlewis.com  
2 Palo Alto Square  
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 700  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122  
Tel: 650.843.4000  
Fax: 650.843.4001

LITTLER MENDELSON  
A Professional Corporation  
Richard W. Black, State Bar No. 467982  
*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
rblack@littler.com  
Barbara I. Antonucci, State Bar No. 209039  
bantonacci@littler.com  
650 California Street, 20th  
San Francisco, CA 94108-2693  
Tel: 415.433.1940  
Fax: 415.399.8490

Attorneys for Defendant

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JEFFREY JOHNSON, JENNIFER  
RIESE, SHAUN SIMMONS, and  
JAMES PURVIS, individually, and on  
behalf of others similarly situated,

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
and DOES 1-25 Inclusive,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 3:09-cv-003596-CRB

**STIPULATION REGARDING ENLARGEMENT  
OF TIME FOR FILING (1) PLAINTIFFS'  
RESPONSE INCLUDING OBJECTIONS TO  
BILL OF COSTS, AND (2) DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES**

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

*STIPULATION RE ENLARGEMENT OF TIME*

Case No. 3:09-cv-003596-CRB, *Johnson, et al., v. Hewlett Packard Co.*

1           1. On August 22, 2011, Defendant filed an *Ex Parte* Application to Extend Time for Filing  
2 of Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Bill of Costs, seeking a fourteen-day enlargement  
3 of time to file its Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Bill of Costs. Plaintiffs did not oppose this  
4 Application and it was granted by the Court.

5           2. On September 1, 2011, Defendant filed its Bill of Costs but moved for a second  
6 enlargement of time, until September 30, 2011, to file its Motion for Attorneys' Fees. This second  
7 request, for an enlargement of time for Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees, was also not  
8 opposed by Plaintiffs, and it was granted on September 9, 2011, allowing Defendant to and  
9 including September 30, 2011, to file any motion for attorneys' fees.

10           3. On September 9, 2011, Plaintiffs requested an enlargement of time to respond,  
11 including file objections to Defendant's Bill of Costs, which was granted. Plaintiffs' response to  
12 Defendant's Bill of Costs is currently due on September 30, 2011.

13           4. On September 27, 2011, Plaintiffs filed their Motion to Defer Consideration of Motions  
14 for Attorneys Fees and Costs Until After Appeal is Completed.

15           5. Further, the Mediation Program of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has set an  
16 Assessment Conference for October 27, 2011 to discuss whether the case is appropriate for the  
17 participation in the Mediation Program. If there is movement towards or settlement of the dispute  
18 at that conference, also within the enlargement of time requested here, then considerable time and  
19 resources would be conserved.

20           6. Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees is currently due September 30, 2011.

21           7. WHEREFORE, both sides stipulate to an extension so that both Plaintiffs' response  
22 including objections to Defendant's Bill of Costs and Defendant's Motion for Attorneys' Fees are  
23 now due October 31, 2011.

1 Dated: September 30, 2011.

2 FRANKLIN D. AZAR & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

3  
4 /s/ Franklin D. Azar

Franklin D. Azar

5 Counsel for Plaintiffs

6  
7 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

8  
9 /s/ Melinda S. Riechert

10 Melinda S. Riechert

11 Counsel for Defendant

12  
13 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED

14  
15 DATED September 30, 2011

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
IT IS SO ORDERED  
  
Judge Charles R. Breyer  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

STIPULATION RE ENLARGEMENT OF TIME

Case No. 3:09-cv-003596-CRB, Johnson, et al., v. Hewlett Packard Co.