1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

parties to file dispositive motions.

WHEREAS, on or about February 9, 2010, Plaintiff filed a separate action in Alameda County Superior Court against Defendant and certain individual employees of the Newark Police Department. In his state court complaint, Plaintiff asserts claims for negligence, defamation per se and libel. He also asserts a claim for sexual orientation harassment and discrimination under California's Fair Employment and Housing Act (Cal. Gov't Code § 12940 et seq.).

WHEREAS, starting on or about July 20, 2010, the parties initiated informal discussions regarding the terms of a global settlement which would resolve this action and Plaintiff's state court action in their entirety.

WHEREAS, to date, the parties have been unable to complete their settlement discussions and will need an additional two to three weeks to do so. Accordingly, in light of their pending settlement discussions and in order to avoid incurring additional and potentially unnecessary fees and costs, the parties respectfully request that the September 10, 2010 deadline to file dispositive motions in this matter be extended to October 1, 2010. This requested extension will not impact any other deadlines currently scheduled in this matter. The next scheduled date in this matter is a November 30, 2010 pretrial conference and the parties' jury trial is scheduled to commence on December 13, 2010.

NOW THEREFORE, THE PARTIES STIPULATE AND AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the September 10, 2010 deadline for the parties to file dispositive motions in this matter be continued until October 1, 2010.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: August 30, 2010 RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI LLP

By:

Timothy G. Yeung Steve Cikes

Attorneys for Defendant City of Newark

- 1	l '
1	
2	LAW OFFICE OF ARKADY ITKIN
3	Dated: August <u>30</u> , 2010
4	By:
5	Arkady Itkin Attorney for Plaintiff Michael Harrington
6	Given the proximity of the resulting hearing date to the Pretrial Conference, there is no assurance the
7	parties will be able to meaningfully prepare and submit their pretrial filings in advance of the Pretrial Conference. Accordingly, the stipulation is hereby DENIED without prejudice to further discussion
8	at the Status Conference. IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	
10	Dated: September 15, 2010 The Honoable Maxine M. Chesney
11	The H no able Maxine M. Chesney UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	