

1 GERAGOS & GERAGOS

2 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
3 LAWYERS  
4 644 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET  
5 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-3411  
6 TELEPHONE (213) 625-3900  
7 FACSIMILE (213) 625-1600

8 MARK J. GERAGOS SBN 108325  
9 SHELLEY KAUFMAN SBN 100696  
10 BENJAMIN MEISELAS SBN 277412  
11 JOHN M. CLIMACO SBN 213224

12 JOHN R. CLIMACO  
13 JOHN A. PECA  
14 DAVID M. CUPPAGE  
15 SCOTT D. SIMPKINS  
16 CLIMACO, WILCOX, PECA, TARANTINO & GAROFOLI, CO., L.P.A.  
17 55 Public Square  
18 Suite 1950  
19 Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
20 Phone: (216) 621-8484  
21 Fax: (216) 771-1632

22 EDWARD W. COCHRAN  
23 20030 Marchmont Road  
24 Shaker Heights, Ohio 44122  
25 Phone: 216-751-5546  
26 Fax: 216-751-6630

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff

28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NOTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. CV12-01863 JSW

Jessica Cantrall, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and the general public,

vs.

Hartford Financial Services Group, Hartford Fire Insurance Company; Property and Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford; Twin City Fire Insurance Company Hartford Underwriters Insurance Company; Hartford Insurance Company of the Midwest; Hartford Casualty Insurance Company; Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company; Hartford Specialty Company and Does 1 through 50, inclusive,

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER RESCHEDULING BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

1 Plaintiff Jessica Cantrall (“Plaintiff”), on the one hand, and Defendants  
2 Hartford Financial Services Group, Hartford Fire Insurance Company; Property and  
3 Casualty Insurance Company of Hartford; Twin City Fire Insurance Company  
4 Hartford Underwriters Insurance Company; Hartford Insurance Company of the  
5 Midwest, Hartford Casualty Insurance Company; Hartford Accident and Indemnity  
6 Company; Hartford Specialty Company (collectively, “Defendants”), on the other  
7 hand, by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:  
8

9 WHEREAS, on April 13, 2012, Plaintiff filed this action against Defendants in  
10 the United States District Court Northern District of California (Doc. 1);  
11

12 WHEREAS, on July 3, 2012, Defendants filed an Amended Notice of Motion  
13 and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint. The Motion is currently set to be heard  
14 on September 14, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. (Doc. 21);  
15

16 WHEREAS, pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-3, Plaintiff’s Opposition is due for  
17 submission on July 13, 2012, based upon the original filing date of the motion.  
18 Defendant’s Reply is due for submission on July 20, 2012.  
19

20 Defendants initially sought an additional two weeks in prepare their Motion to  
21 Dismiss until June 12, 2012, and then a second stipulation to file the Motion on June  
22 29, 2012. At that time, because of the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday, Defendants agreed that they  
23 would stipulate to an extension of time for Plaintiffs to file the opposition, if  
24 necessary. Initially, Plaintiffs believed that the opposition could be filed within the  
25 time frame of the service of the initial Motion; however Defendants indicated that  
26 they would require further time to submit their reply based upon vacation schedules of  
27 counsel.  
28

1 As the Motion raises numerous issues and attaches multiple exhibits, Plaintiff  
2 requires additional time to submit her opposition in light of the holiday week which  
3 has caused some delay in preparing the opposition and various holiday schedules of  
4 counsel involved in the preparation of the opposition.

5  
6 Further, under the current briefing schedule Defendants' lead counsel will be  
7 unavailable for four of the seven days Defendants have to prepare their reply brief due  
8 to vacation. Furthermore, additional counsel necessary to the preparation of the reply  
9 will be out of the country from July 14 through 26.

10  
11 WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Defendants each desire additional time to oppose and  
12 reply to the Motion. Based on this fact and based on the fact that Defendants' Notice  
13 of Motion is set sufficiently in advance to permit an enlargement of the current  
14 briefing schedule, the Parties hereby stipulate pursuant to Civil L.R. 6-2, and hereby  
15 respectfully request the Court's permission to change the current briefing schedule  
16 accordingly:

17 ///

18 ///

- 1 a) The date for filing Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss  
2 be changed to July 23, 2012.
- 3 b) The date for filing Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition be changed  
4 to August 9, 2012.
- 5 c) The hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss remains unchanged.
- 6  
7

8 DATED: July 11, 2012

GERAGOS & GERAGOS, APC

9  
10 By: \_\_\_\_\_/S/  
11 SHELLEY KAUFMAN  
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
13 JESSICA CANTRALL

14 DATED: July 11, 2012

STEIN & LUBIN LLP

15 By: \_\_\_\_\_/S/  
16 ELLEN A. CIRANGLE  
17 Attorneys for Defendants  
18 HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES  
19 GROUP, HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE  
20 COMPANY; PROPERTY AND CASUALTY  
21 INSURANCE COMPANY OF HARTFORD;  
22 TWIN CITY FIRE INSURANCE  
23 COMPANY HARTFORD  
24 UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE  
25 COMPANY; HARTFORD INSURANCE  
26 COMPANY OF THE MIDWEST,  
27 HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE  
28 COMPANY; HARTFORD ACCIDENT AND  
INDEMNITY COMPANY; HARTFORD  
SPECIALTY COMPANY

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

Therefore, good cause appearing, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss shall be due on July 23, 2012.
2. Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition shall be due on August 9, 2012.
3. The hearing date on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, currently set for September 14, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. shall remain unchanged.

DATED: July 13, 2012

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE