	) Filed01/23/12 Page1 of 4
Karl S. Kronenberger (SBN 226112)	Thomas M. Peterson (SBN 96011)
Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld (SBN 222187)	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
Virginia A. Sanderson (SBN 240241) <b>KRONENBERGER ROSENFELD</b> ,	LLP One Market, Spear Street Tower
LLP	San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
150 Post Street, Suite 520	Telephone: (415) 442-1000
San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: (415) 955-1155	Facsimile: (415) 442-1001 tmpeterson@morganlewis.com
Facsimile: (415) 955-1158	
karl@KRInternetLaw.com jeff@KRInternetLaw.com	Kristofor T. Henning (pro hac vice
ginny@KRInternetLaw.com	application pending) Ezra D. Church ( <i>pro hac vice</i>
	application pending) MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
Attorneys for Plaintiff	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
Myron M. Cherry	1701 Market Street
MÝRON M. CHERRY &	Philadelphia, PA 19103 Talaphana: (215) 063 5000
ASSOCIATES, LLC 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2300	Telephone: (215) 963-5000 Facsimile: (215) 963-5001
Chicago, Illinois 60602	khenning@morganlewis.com
Telephone: (312) 372-2100 Facsimile: (312) 853-0279	echurch@morganlewis.com
mcherry@cherry-law.com	Attorneys for Defendant Hewlett-
	Packard Company
Attorneys for Defendant Regent Group, Inc.	
p,	
UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCI	ISCO DIVISION
CAROL HILL CASTAGNOLA,	CASE NO • CV 11 5772 ISW
CAROL HILL CASTAGNOLA, an individual, individually and on behalf of a class of similarly	CASE NO.: CV 11-5772 JSW
behalf of a class of similarly	
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons,	STIPULATION REGARDING
behalf of a class of similarly	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons,	STIPULATION REGARDING
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM. a California	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM. a California	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
behalf of a class of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff, v. HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY dba SNAPFISH.COM, a California corporation, and REGENT GROUP, INC. dba ENCORE MARKETING INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corporation,	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AS MODIFIED HEREIN; SETTING HEARING DATE FOR MOTION TO DISMISS AND VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

WHEREAS, Plaintiff Carol Hill Castagnola ("Plaintiff") filed a class action
 complaint (the "Complaint") against Hewlett-Packard Company and Regent
 Group, Inc. ("Defendants") on December 1, 2011;

WHEREAS, by agreement, Defendants obtained a prior extension of time
to respond to the Complaint until January 26, 2012 (Dkt. Nos. 9 and 15);

6 WHEREAS, the Complaint includes a claim against Defendants alleging a
7 violation of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (CLRA). In its present
8 form, the Complaint seeks only injunctive relief for Plaintiff's CLRA claim; but
9 Plaintiff has indicated her intent to amend the Complaint to assert a claim for
10 damages under the CLRA;

WHEREAS, in order to streamline the process for Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's anticipated Amended Complaint and to avoid unnecessary delay spent addressing the Complaint, the Parties have met and conferred regarding a proposed briefing schedule on Defendants' anticipated motions to dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and to coordinate the Initial Case Management Conference presently scheduled for March 16, 2012 with the hearing for Defendants' motions;

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED THAT:

1. Defendants need not answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint.

20 2. Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint on or before February 3,
21 2012.

3. Defendants shall file their anticipated motions to dismiss the
Amended Complaint on or before February 24, 2012.

24 4. Plaintiff shall file her opposition to Defendants' motions to dismiss on
25 or before March 23, 2012.

26 5. Defendants shall file their replies in further support of their motions to
27 dismiss on or before April 13, 2012.

28

17

18

19

	Case3:11-cv-05772-JSW Document20 Filed01/23/12 Page3 of 4
1 2	6. A hearing on Defendants' anticipated motions to dismiss shall be scheduled at the Court's convenience and the Initial Case Management Conference
3	presently scheduled for March 16, 2012 shall be rescheduled for the same date as
4	any such hearing.
5	Dated: January 23, 2012
6	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS KRONENBERGER ROSENFELD,
7	LLP LLP
8 9 10	By: <u>/s/ Thomas M. Peterson</u> THOMAS M. PETERSON Attorneys for Defendant Hewlett- Packard Company By: <u>/s/ Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld</u> JEFFREY M. ROSENFELD Attorneys for Plaintiff Carol Hill Castagnola
11 12	MYRON M. CHERRY & ASSOCIATES, LLC
13 14 15	By: <u>/s/ Myron M. Cherry</u> MYRON M. CHERRY Attorneys for Defendant Regent Group, Inc.
16 17 18	Defendants shall notice the motion to dismiss for hearing on May 4, 2012. The Case Management Conference shall be rescheduled after the motions to dismiss are resolved. PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED
19 20	DATED: January 31, 2012 How Jeffrey S. WHITE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
27	
28	
	STIPULATION REGARDING DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT – CASE NO. CV 11-5772 JSW