25

26

27

28

## 1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 10 ROY D. NEWPORT, et al., No. C 10-04511 WHA 11 Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants, 12 v. 13 BURGER KING CORPORATION, 14 Defendant/Counter-Claimant, 15 v. 16 ANTELOPE VALLEY RESTAURANTS, INC, et al., 17 Counter-Defendants. 18 MOHAN VALLABHAPURAPU, et al., 19 No. C 11-667 WHA Plaintiffs, 20 ORDER GRANTING BURGER v. 21 KING CORPORATION BURGER KING CORPORATION, 22 MOTION FOR SUMMARY Defendant. JUDGMENT AND OTHERWISE 23 STAYING NEWPORT ACTION 24

All proceedings in *Newport v. Burger King Corporation*, No. 10-4511, are stayed pending further order with the sole exception that Burger King Corporation may bring a summary judgment motion, limited to twenty pages in briefing and two hundred pages in exhibits, directed solely at whether the *Day* settlement created any rights in favor of the franchisees so as to create a duty of care in their favor. All oppositions must be joint and must be limited to twenty pages and

two hundred pages of exhibits. The reply shall be ten pages (no exhibits). Said motion may be brought within 14 calendar days of the date of this order. The same motion must also be filed in *Vallabhapurapu v. Burger King Corporation*, No. 11-667, so as to have parallel effect in both cases.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 4, 2012.

LLIAM ALSUP

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE