1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP JOHN M. GRENFELL (CA Bar No. 88500) john.grenfell@pillsburylaw.com JACOB R. SORENSEN (CA Bar No. 209134) jake.sorensen@pillsburylaw.com FUSAE NARA ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) fusae.nara@pillsburylaw.com ANDREW D. LANPHERE (CA Bar No. 191479) andrew.lanphere@pillsburylaw.com 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 983-1000 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200 Attorneys for Defendants		
9	SHARP CORPORATION and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION		
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 [PR <del>QPOSE</del> D]	
18	Case No. 3:11-cv-711 SI	ORDER EXTENDING SHARP'S TIME TO ANSWER AMENDED	
19 20	STATE OF NEW YORK, by and through, ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN, Attorney	COMPLAINT	
	General,		
21	Plaintiff,		
22	V.		
23	AU Optronics Corporation, et al.,		
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		ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
2		Attorney General of the State of New York
3		By: <u>/s/ Richard L. Schwartz</u> Richard L. Schwartz
		Acting Bureau Chief, Antitrust Bureau
4		Amy McFarlane
5		Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Plaintiff
6		120 Broadway, 26th Floor
6		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		PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
10		JOHN M. GRENFELL
11		JACOB R. SORENSEN
10		FUSAE NARA
12		ANDREW D. LANPHERE 50 Fremont Street
13		San Francisco, CA 94105
14		,
14		
15		By: /s/ John M. Grenfell John M. Grenfell
16		John W. Greinen
		Attorneys for Defendants SHARP CORPORATION
17		and SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
18	ATTESTATION: Pursuant to Gen	eral Order 45, Part X-B, the filer attests that the
19	concurrence of the other signatory h	ereto has been obtained.
20		
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
22	10/25/11	Sugar Notata
23	Dated:10/25/11	Honorable Susan Illston
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		