1	MITCHELL S. FUERST				
2	Florida Bar No. 264598				
2	mfuerst@fuerstlaw.com Fuerst Ittleman, PL				
3	1001 Brickell Bay Drive, Suite 2002				
4	Miami, Florida 33131	•			
4	Telephone: (305) 350-5690				
5	Facsimile: (305) 371-8989				
6	Appearing pro hac vice				
7	LESLIE HOLMES				
•	California Bar No. 192608				
8	Leslie@HULawyers.com				
9	HOLMES & USOZ, LLP				
פ	333 West Santa Clara Street, Suite 805				
10	San Jose, California 95113				
3.1	Telephone: (408) 292-7600				
11	Facsimile: (408) 292-7611				
12	Attorney for Defendants:				
13	WELLNESS SUPPORT NETWORK, INC.,				
13	ROBERT HELD, and				
14	ROBYN HELD				
15					
רז	INITED OTATE	C DICTRICT COLUDT			
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
17	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION				
1 /	D/HV / Id HV				
18					
19	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,	Case No.: 3:10-cv-04879-JCS			
20	Plaintiff,	JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE; DECLARATION OF			
21	v.	MITCHELL S. FUERST IN SUPPORT			
22	WELLNESS SUPPORT NETWORK, INC., a	Hearing Date: TBD			
23	corporation, ROBERT HELD, individually and	Courtroom A, 15th Floor			
24	as an officer of Wellness Support Network, Inc., and ROBYN HELD, individually and as	Magistrate Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero			
25	an officer of Wellness Support Network, Inc.,				
2	Defendants.				
26	20101111111				
27					
28					

3:10-cv-04879-JCS JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE 

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 18, 2011, pursuant to a stipulation by the parties to revise the stipulated and ordered schedule for this matter (Dkt #22), the Court entered an order (Dkt #26) setting deadlines for, among other things, the filing deadlines for Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and Defendants' responsive papers, the parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, file a Rule 26(f) report, complete initial disclosures, and file a Case Management Schedule. The parties requested revision of the schedule because of the Court's Order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint filed on December 29, 2010 (Dkt #24).

On April 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed its Amended Complaint for Permanent Injunction or other Equitable Relief (Dkt #27). As per the Court's April 18 Order, Defendants' responsive pleadings to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are due May 19, 2011. However, given the complexities associated with this case, as well as undersigned counsel's scheduling conflicts during the month of May, the parties agreed to a 20-day extension of that deadline. Given that extension, the parties also agreed that the tasks to be performed as required by the *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications stipulated to below.

At this time, pursuant to L.R. 6-2 and L.R. 7-12, the parties respectfully request that the deadlines set in the Court's April 18, 2011 Order be extended by an additional 20 days. The proposed schedule is set forth below.

## II. PROPOSED REVISED SCHEDULE

The parties propose the following modifications to the current schedule for this case:

1. Defendants' Answer and/or other responsive pleadings shall be filed no later than June 8, 2011.

1		2.	The last day to meet and confer	regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR	
2	process selection, and discovery plan shall be July 5, 2011.				
3		3.	The last day to file for ADR Certification	fication shall be July 5, 2011.	
4		4.	The last day to file either a Stipu	lation to ADR Process or Notice of Need for ADR	
5	Phone Conference shall be July 5, 2011.				
6		5.	·	ports, complete initial disclosures or state objections	
7			-		
8	in a Rule 26(f) Report, and file a Case Management Statement shall be July 18, 2011.  29				
9		6.	The Initial Case Management Con	ference shall be held on July <del>28,</del> 2011.	
10	III.	CON	CLUSION		
11		The pa	arties respectfully request that the C	ourt revise the schedule as set forth above.	
13	Respectfully submitted,				
14	Dated:	May 1	2, 2011	FUERST ITTLEMAN, PL	
15				HOLMES & USOZ, LLP	
16				By: /s/ Mitchell S. Fuerst	
17   18				Mitchell S. Fuerst Attorney for Defendants, WELLNESS SUPPORT NETWORK, ROBERT HELD, and	
19				ROBYN HELD	
20				By: /s/ Leslie Holmes	
21				Leslie Holmes Attorney for Defendants, WELLNESS	
22				SUPPORT NETWORK, ROBERT HELD, and ROBYN HELD	
23	Datade	May 12	2 2011	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION	
24	Dateu.	Iviay 12	2, 2011		
25				By: <u>/s/ Laura Fremont</u> Laura Fremont	
26				Kenneth H. Abbe Attorney for Plaintiff, FEDERAL TRADE	
27				COMMISSION	
28					

3:10-cv-04879-JCS JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE

## Case3:10-cv-04879-JCS Document28 Filed05/12/11 Page4 of 6

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: <u>5/16/11</u>

1.

RED

STATES DISTRICT

OF THE S

3:10-cv-04879-JCS JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE 

## I, MITCHELL S. FUERST, declare as follows: 1. I am counsel for Wellness Support Network, Inc. ("Wellness"), Robert Held and

**DECLARATION OF MITCHELL S. FUERST** 

IN SUPPORT OF JOINT STIPULATION TO REVISE SCHEDULE

- 1. I am counsel for Wellness Support Network, Inc. ("Wellness"), Robert Held and Robyn Held, (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants"), Defendants in the above-captioned action. I make this Declaration in support of the foregoing Joint Stipulation to Revise Schedule. I have personal knowledge of each of the following facts, and would and could competently testify thereto if called upon to do so in a court of law.
- 2. Reasons for the requested enlargement of time (Local Rule 6-2(a)(1)): The current deadline for the Defendants to file their responsive papers to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is May 19, 2011. However, given the complexities associated with this case, as well as undersigned counsel's scheduling conflicts during the month of May, undersigned counsel requested and the government agreed to a 20-day extension of that deadline. Given that extension, the parties also agreed that the tasks to be performed as required by the *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications included in the attached stipulation.
- 3. **Disclosure of all previous time modifications (Local Rule 6-2(a)(2)):** The Plaintiff filed its Complaint (Dkt #1) in this matter on October 28, 2010. Defendants' initial deadline to respond to the Complaint was November 26, 2010. On November 24, 2010, the parties filed a stipulation (Dkt #5) to extend that deadline to December 29, 2010; to set the deadline for Plaintiff to file its opposition to any papers filed by Defendants responsive to the Complaint to January 14, 2011; and to set the hearing for such matters for February 4, 2011. The Court so ordered on November 29, 2010 (Dkt #6).

On December 15, 2010, the parties filed a stipulation (Dkt #7) to modify the times set in the Court's *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* (Dkt #3). The Court so ordered on December 15, 2010 (Dkt #8).

On January 26, 2011, the parties filed a Second Stipulation to Revise Schedule (Dkt #21) to modify the times set in the Court's *Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines* (Dkt #3). The Court so ordered on January 27, 2011 (Dkt #22).

On April 4, 2011, the Court entered an Order (Dkt #24) granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint. As a result of this Order, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation (Dkt # 25) on April 18, 2011 to provide timeframes for Plaintiff to re-plead its Complaint in part and for Defendants to file responsive papers. The Court so ordered on April 18, 2011 (Dkt #26).

4. Description of the effect the requested time modification would have on the schedule for the case (Local Rule 6-2(a)(3)): The proposed time modifications would extend the time for those matters set in the order issued by the Court (Dkt # 26), but the parties believe doing so would add to the long-term efficient conduct of this case. The tasks to be performed as required by the Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines would be performed more accurately and efficiently based upon the time modifications included in the attached stipulation.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration was executed on May 12, 2011 at Miami. Florida.

/s/ Mitchell S. Fuerst
Mitchell S. Fuerst
Attorney for Defendant