

1 ROBERT E. CAREY, JR. (SBN 47556)
 2 JERRY Y. FONG, ESQ. (SBN 99673)
 3 CAREY & CAREY
 4 706 COWPER STREET
 5 P.O. BOX 1040
 6 PALO ALTO, CA 94302-1040
 7 650/328-5510
 8 650/853-3632 fax
 9 rec@careyandcareylaw.com
 10 jf@careyandcareylaw.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff JONATHAN B. BUCKHEIT

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 JONATHAN B. BUCKHEIT,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 TONY DENNIS, DEAN DEVLUGT,
 19 THE TOWN OF ATHERTON,
 20 THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO,
 21 ANTHONY KOCKLER, & JERRY
 22 CARLSON,

23 Defendants.

CASE NO. CV 09-5000 JCS

STIPULATION FOR AN ORDER
 TO EXTEND TIME FOR PLAINTIFF
 TO FILE OPPOSITION TO SAN
 MATEO COUNTY'S MOTION TO
 DISMISS 2ND AMENDED COMPLAINT
 & PROPOSED ORDER RE SAME.

Date: September 3, 2010
 Time: 9:30 a.m.
 Mag.-Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero

24 Pursuant to Local Rules 6-2 (a) and 7-12, Plaintiff Jonathan Buckheit and Defendant
 25 County of San Mateo hereby stipulate to request that the Court order the extension of the
 26 deadline (by one week) for the filing of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant County of San
 27 Mateo's Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (currently scheduled
 28 to be heard on September 3, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. before this Court), from July 23, 2010 to July
 30, 2010, and, correspondingly, extend Defendant County of San Mateo's deadline to file its
 reply, from July 30, 2010 to August 6, 2010. The extension of time would not affect the

1 hearing date of the motion (September 3, 2010) and would still be 4 weeks ahead of the
2 Local Rule 7-3 (a) and (c)'s scheduling/deadline requirement (opposition to be filed 21 days
3 before hearing and reply to be filed 14 days before hearing). This is the first request for an
4 extension of time for the briefing re this motion to dismiss the 2nd Amended Complaint.

5 It is so stipulated.

6
7 DATED: July 21, 2010

8 /S/
9 JERRY Y. FONG, for Plaintiff
10 JONATHAN BUCKHEIT

11
12
13 DATED: July 21, 2010

14 /S/
15 BRIAN WONG, for Defendant COUNTY OF
16 SAN MATEO

17 This stipulation is supported by the following declaration of Attorney Jerry Fong:

18 DECLARATION OF ATTORNEY JERRY FONG

19 I, Jerry Fong, declare:

- 20 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before this Court and am one of the
21 attorneys for Plaintiff Jonathan Buckheit.
- 22 2. I make this declaration in compliance with Local Rule 6-2 (a).
- 23 3. Currently, Defendant San Mateo County's motion to dismiss Plaintiff's Second
24 Amended Complaint is scheduled to be heard on September 3, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., before this
25 Court.
- 26 4. When it moved the hearing to September 3, 2010, the Court ordered that the
27 briefing schedule remain the same as it had been when the original hearing date was August
28 13, 2010, meaning that the deadline for the filing of Plaintiff's Opposition would be July 23,
2010, and the deadline for the filing of Defendant San Mateo County's reply would be July

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

PURSUANT TO THE STIPULATION AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING
HEREIN, IT IS SO ORDERED THAT: Plaintiff shall file his Opposition to Defendant San
Mateo County's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint on July 30,
2010, and the Defendant County of San Mateo shall file its Reply, if any, on August 6, 2010.
The hearing for the motions shall remain on September 3, 2010, at 9:30 a.m.

DATED: 07/22/10

