

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF OAKLAND PORT, a municipal corporation, acting by and through its board of port commissioners,

No. C 11-01709 WHA

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING  
STIPULATED REQUEST  
TO CHANGE TIME**

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, a municipal corporation,


Defendant.

The parties jointly request approximately a five-week extension of the current dates and deadlines for (1) responding to the complaint, (2) conducting ADR planning, (3) conducting Rule 26 planning, and (4) attending the initial case management conference. The parties explain that they “are engaged in discussions regarding narrowing or resolving all, or some of, the issues in the Complaint without further litigation” (Dkt. No. 16).

Good cause not having been shown, the request is **DENIED**. Litigation must proceed in a timely fashion despite parallel efforts to settle the case. The parties are reminded, however, that pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1 they may stipulate to extending the time within which to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint *without* a court order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 5, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California