1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMA JOHN M. GRENFELL (CA Bar No. 88500) john.grenfell@pillsburylaw.com JACOB R. SORENSEN (CA Bar No. 20913 jake.sorensen@pillsburylaw.com FUSAE NARA (<i>pro hac vice</i>) fusae.nara@pillsburylaw.com ANDREW D. LANPHERE (CA Bar No. 19 andrew.lanphere@pillsburylaw.com 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 983-1000 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200 Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION	4)
10		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
14		
15	IN RE: TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. 3:07-md-1827 SI MDL No. 1827
16		
17	This Document Relates To:	STIPULATION AND [P ROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING SHARP'S TIME
18	Case No. 3:11-cv-711 SI	TO ANSWER AMENDED
19 20	STATE OF NEW YORK, by and through, ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN, Attorney General,	COMPLAINT
21	Plaintiff,	
22		
23	v. AU Optronics Corporation, <i>et al.</i> ,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	WHEREAS plaintiff State of New York filed an Amended Complaint in the above-	
2	captioned case against Defendants AU Optronics Corporation, AU Optronics Corporation	
3	America, Inc., Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics USA, Inc.,	
4	CMO Japan Co., Ltd., Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices	
5	(USA), Inc., LG Display Co., Ltd., LG Display America, Inc., Samsung Electronics Co.,	
6	Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., Sharp	
7	Corporation, Sharp Electronics Corporation, Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba Matsushita	
8	Display Technology Co., Ltd., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba	
9	America Electronic Components, Inc. on March 15, 2011, Dkt. no. 2556;	
10	WHEREAS the Court granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to	
11	dismiss the Amended Complaint on August 9, 2011;	
12	WHEREAS Sharp Corporation and Sharp Electronics Corporation (together,	
13	"Sharp") desire a reasonable amount of time to answer the Amended Complaint;	
14	WHEREAS the Court previously entered Orders extending the time to answer the	
15	Amended Complaint on August 25, 2011, as stipulated by Plaintiff and Sharp and on	
16	September 13, 2011, as stipulated by Plaintiff and Sharp; and	
17	WHEREAS the requested time modification will not affect any other deadline in	
18	this case.	
19	THEREFORE, the State of New York and Sharp hereby agree that Sharp's deadline	
20	to answer to the Amended Complaint shall be November 28, 2011.	
21	Dated: October 25, 2011	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1		RIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
2	At	ttorney General of the State of New York
3	•	y: /s/ Richard L. Schwartz
-		Richard L. Schwartz Acting Bureau Chief, Antitrust Bureau
4		Amy McFarlane
5		Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Plaintiff
6		120 Broadway, 26th Floor
0		New York, New York 10271 (212) 416-8282 (Phone)
7		(212) 416-6015 (Facsimile)
8		Richard.Schwartz@ag.ny.gov
9		Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New York
10	PI	ILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
10		OHN M. GRENFELL
11		ACOB R. SORENSEN
10	-	USAE NARA NDREW D. LANPHERE
12		0 Fremont Street
13		an Francisco, CA 94105
14		
15	Ву	y:/s/ John M. Grenfell
15		John M. Grenfell
16	A 4	the mary for Defendents SUADD CODDOD ATION
17		ttorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION nd SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
18	ATTESTATION: Pursuant to Genera	ral Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that the
19	concurrence of the other signatory here	reto has been obtained.
20		
21		
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.	Sugar Matter
23	Dated: <u>10/25/11</u>	Honorable Susan Illston
23		Honorable Susan Inston
25		
26		
27		
28		