

1 Sean P. Reis (SBN 184004)
 sreis@edelson.com
 2 EDELSON MCGUIRE LLP
 30021 Tomas Street, Suite 300
 3 Rancho Santa Margarita, California 92688
 Telephone: (949) 459-2124
 4 Facsimile: (949) 459-2123

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Kimberly Yordy*

6 Nickolas A. Kacprowski (SBN 242684)
 nickolas.kacprowski@kirkland.com
 7 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
 555 California Street
 8 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 439-1400
 9 Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

10 *Attorneys for Defendants Plimus, Inc. and Great Hill Partners, LLC*

11 [Additional counsel included in signature block.]

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 KIMBERLY YORDY, on behalf of herself and all
 others similarly situated,
 16 *Plaintiff,*
 17
 18 v.
 19 PLIMUS, INC., a California corporation, and
 GREAT HILL PARTNERS, LLC, a Massachusetts
 limited liability company,
 20 *Defendants.*
 21

Case No. 12-cv-00229-TEH
**STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF
 BRIEFING SCHEDULE RELATED TO
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
 COMPLAINT**

Judge: Honorable Thelton E. Henderson
 Action filed: January 13, 2012

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-12 and this Court’s Standing Order, Plaintiff Kimberly Yordy and
2 Defendants Plimus, Inc. (“Plimus”) and Great Hill Partners, LLC (“Great Hill”) (collectively, the
3 “Parties”), by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and agree to extend the
4 briefing schedule on Defendants’ pending motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint. In support of the
5 instant stipulation, the Parties state as follows:

6 **WHEREAS**, on January 13, 2012, Plaintiff Yordy filed her putative class action complaint
7 (the “Complaint”) against Plimus and Great Hill, (Dkt. No. 1);

8 **WHEREAS**, on March 2, 2012, Plimus and Great Hill jointly moved to dismiss the
9 Complaint in its entirety, (Dkt. No. 29);

10 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiff is currently reviewing the arguments made in Defendants’ pending
11 motion;

12 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiff requires additional time to prepare an adequate response to
13 Defendants’ motion;

14 **WHEREAS**, the Parties have conferred regarding Plaintiff’s need for additional time to
15 prepare a response to Defendants’ motion, and have agreed that she may have an extension of time
16 through and including March 23, 2012, to file her opposition to the motion;

17 **WHEREAS**, the Parties have further agreed that following the filing of Plaintiff’s
18 opposition, Defendants shall have through and including April 6, 2012, to reply in support of their
19 motion;

20 **WHEREAS**, good cause exists for the extensions of time contemplated herein and such
21 extensions are not sought for any improper purpose;

22 **NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED:**

23 1. Plaintiff shall have an extension of time through and including March 23, 2012, to
24 file her response to Defendants’ pending motion to dismiss the Complaint;

25 2. Defendants shall have through and including April 6, 2012, to file a reply in support
26 of their motion to dismiss the Complaint; and,
27
28

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

Jeffrey L. Willian (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
jeffrey.willian@kirkland.com
Jordan M. Heinz (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
jordan.heinz@kirkland.com
Sylvia Nichole Winston (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
sylvia.winston@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
300 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 03/16/2012

HONORABLE JUDGE THELTON E. HENDERSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

