| | | *E-Filed 5/2/11* | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | BRUCE D. GOLDSTEIN, State Bar No. 135 County Counsel ANNE L. KECK, State Bar No. 136315 Deputy County Counsel County of Sonoma 575 Administration Drive, Room 105A Santa Rosa, California 95403-2815 Telephone: (707) 565-2421 Facsimile: (707) 565-2624 E-mail: akeck@sonoma-county.org Attorneys for Defendants the County of Sonoma, Former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and County employees Michael Shanahan, Caroline Japp, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty | 5970 | |
| 10 | Johnson, and Robin Smith | | |
| 11 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 12 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 13 | SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | |
| 14 | SALLY STEINHART, | No. CV-10-00841 RS | |
| 15 | Plaintiff, | STIPULATION FOR ORDERS TO: (1) EXTEND TIME FOR FILING A THIRD | |
| 16 | V. | AMENDED COMPLAINT; (2) EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT | |
| 17 | COUNTY OF SONOMA, et al., | AND FILE ANTI-SLAPP MOTION; | |
| | COUNT I OF SONOMA, et al., | AND FILE ANTI-SLAPP MOTION; [PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 18 | Defendants. | | |
| 18 19 | | | |
| | Defendants. | | |
| 19 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b | [PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 19 20 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S | [PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 19 20 21 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol | [PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 19 20 21 22 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol Johnson and Robin Smith (collectively, "Cou | [PROPOSED] ORDER / by and between Plaintiff in pro per, Sally Steinhart Sonoma, former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and ine Jaap, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol Johnson and Robin Smith (collectively, "Con parties request that the Court further extend to | [PROPOSED] ORDER / by and between Plaintiff in pro per, Sally Steinhart Sonoma, former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and ine Jaap, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty anty Defendants"). Through this stipulation, these | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol Johnson and Robin Smith (collectively, "Con parties request that the Court further extend to ("TAC") through May 20, 2011, and to conc | [PROPOSED] ORDER / by and between Plaintiff in pro per, Sally Steinhart Sonoma, former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and ine Jaap, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty anty Defendants"). Through this stipulation, these the time for Plaintiff to file a Third Amended Complaint | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol Johnson and Robin Smith (collectively, "Cou parties request that the Court further extend to ("TAC") through May 20, 2011, and to conc a response to the TAC and to file an Anti-SL | [PROPOSED] ORDER / by and between Plaintiff in pro per, Sally Steinhart Sonoma, former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and ine Jaap, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty anty Defendants"). Through this stipulation, these the time for Plaintiff to file a Third Amended Complaint omitantly extend the time for County Defendants to file | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 | Defendants. This joint stipulation is entered into b ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants the County of S County employees Michael Shanahan, Carol Johnson and Robin Smith (collectively, "Cou parties request that the Court further extend to ("TAC") through May 20, 2011, and to conc a response to the TAC and to file an Anti-SL Section 425.16 through June 28, 2011. Defe | [PROPOSED] ORDER / by and between Plaintiff in pro per, Sally Steinhart Sonoma, former Sheriff-Coroner William Cogbill, and ine Jaap, Jo Weber, Nicholas Honey, Jerry Allen, Betty unty Defendants"). Through this stipulation, these the time for Plaintiff to file a Third Amended Complaint omitantly extend the time for County Defendants to file APP Motion under California Code of Civil Procedure | |

1

| 1 | RECITALS | | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2 | A. Plaintiff initiated this action on February 26, 2010, and filed her First Amended | | | |
| 3 | Complaint on June 21, 2010 (Dkt. No. 8). County Defendants responded by filing their Motion to | | | |
| 4 | Dismiss the First Amended Complaint and Motion for More Definite Statement on July 26, 2010 | | | |
| 5 | (Dkt. No. 12) (hereinafter, the "Motions"). The Court resolved the County Defendants' Motions on | | | |
| 6 | February 7, 2011, through its "Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motion to Dismiss and | | | |
| 7 | Denying Motion for a More Definite Statement" (Dkt. No. 34) (hereinafter, the "2/7/11 Order"). | | | |
| 8 | Thereafter, Plaintiff timely filed her Second Amended Complaint on March 9, 2011 (Dkt. No. 38). | | | |
| 9 | B. On April 4, 2011, this Court approved a stipulation of the parties and entered an | | | |
| 10 | order: (1) permitting Plaintiff to file a TAC through April 29, 2011; (2) providing County | | | |
| 11 | Defendants through May 31, 2011, to file a respond to the TAC and an Anti-SLAPP motion under | | | |
| 12 | California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16; and (3) continuing the Case Management | | | |
| 13 | Conference to July 14, 2011, at 10:00 a.m. (Docket No. 41.) | | | |
| 14 | C. Plaintiff has requested additional time in which to prepare and file her TAC through | | | |
| 15 | May 20, 2011, and County Defendants agree to such request. In return, Plaintiff has agreed to | | | |
| 16 | extend the time in which County Defendants may file a response to the TAC, and an Anti-SLAPP | | | |
| 17 | Motion under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16, through June 28, 2011. ¹ The | | | |
| 18 | parties have agreed to retain the current Case Management Conference date of July 14, 2011. | | | |
| 19 | D. The parties believe that such additional time is warranted to provide Plaintiff with the | | | |
| 20 | opportunity to further research and investigate the claims in her complaint, to conform the TAC to | | | |
| 21 | the Court's 2/7/11 Order, and to provide County Defendants with sufficient time in which to | | | |
| 22 | respond. | | | |
| 23 | WHEREFORE, the parties to this stipulation hereby agree and request entry of a court order | | | |
| 24 | as follows: | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | ¹ This Court has the discretion under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16(f) to | | | |
| 28 | extend the initial 60-day filing period for Anti-SLAPP motions to "any later time upon terms it deems proper." | | | |
| | Stipulation for Orders: (1) to Extend Time for Filing a Third Amended Complaint, et al.;USDC Case No. CV-10-00841 RS[Proposed] Order2 | | | |

USDC Case No. CV-10-00841 RS

| 1 | | STIPULATION | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | 1. The parties request that the time in which Plaintiff may file a third amended | | | |
| 2 | complaint in this case be extended through and including May 20, 2011. | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | 2. The parties request that time in which County Defendants may file a response to the current Second Amended Complaint or any third amended complaint (if filed) be extended through | | | |
| 6 | and including June 28, 2011. | | | |
| 7 | 3. The parties request that the time in which County Defendants may file their Anti- | | | |
| 8 | SLAPP motion under California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16 as to certain State Law | | | |
| 9 | claims alleged herein be extended through and including June 28, 2011. | | | |
| 10 | 4. This stipulation does not prevent or preclude the parties from seeking additional relief | | | |
| 11 | from this Court, to amend this stipulation and order or otherwise. | | | |
| 12 | from and court, to amond this suparation | Respectfully submitted, | | |
| 13 | Dated: April 29, 2011 | Bruce D. Goldstein, County Counsel | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 | | By: <u>/s/ Anne L. Keck</u> Anne L. Keck, Deputy County Counsel Attorneys for County Defendants | | |
| 16 | | | | |
| 17 | Dated: April 29, 2011 | Sally Steinhart, Plaintiff in pro per | | |
| 18 | | By:/s/ Sally Steinhart | | |
| 19 | | By: /s/ Sally Steinhart Sally Steinhart | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |
| | Standation for Only (1) (E. (177) (| | | |
| | Stipulation for Orders: (1) to Extend Time for Filing a Third Amended Complaint, <i>et al.</i> ; [Proposed] Order | 3 USDC Case No. CV-10-00841 RS | | |

| 1 | [PROPOSED] ORDER | | |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | Pursuant to and in accordance with the foregoing Stipulation, and with good cause appearing, | | |
| 3 | it is hereby ordered as follows: | | |
| 4 | 1. The time in which Plaintiff may file a third amended complaint in this case is extended | | |
| 5 | through and including May 20, 2011. | | |
| 6 | 2. The time in which County Defendants may file a response to the current Second | | |
| 7 | Amended Complaint or any third amended complaint (if filed) is extended through and including | | |
| 8 | June 28, 2011. | | |
| 9 | 3. The time in which County Defendants may file their Anti-SLAPP motion under | | |
| 10 | California Code of Civil Procedure Section 425.16 as to certain State Law claims alleged herein is | | |
| 11 | extended through and including June 28, 2011. | | |
| 12 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 13 | Date: <u>4/29/11</u> HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG | | |
| 14 | United States District Judge | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |
| | Stipulation for Orders: (1) to Extend Time for Filing a Third Amended Complaint, et al.; [Proposed] Order 4 USDC Case No. CV-10-00841 RS | | |