

Janelle Egger
 1020 Angel Hts.
 Fortuna, CA
 (707) 725-2195
 njjr@sbcglobal.net
 Pro Se Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JANELLE EGGER

Plaintiff,

vs.

COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT,
 HUMBOLDT COUNTY BOARD OF
 SUPERVISORS

Defendant(s).

Case Number: CV 12 2671 CRB

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
 ORDER TO ADJUST BRIEFING
 SCHEDULE WITH REGARD TO
 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

HEARING DATE: July 13, 2012

HEARING TIME: 10:00am

JUDGE: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

COURTROOM: 6

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, Defendant County of Humboldt and Plaintiff Janelle Egger hereby stipulate and request that the Court adjust the briefing schedule on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction in this matter as follows: Plaintiff's Reply is due on Thursday June 28, 2012.


IT IS SO STIPULATED.

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER TO ADJUST BRIEFING SCHEDULE WITH
 REGARD TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION


CASE NO. 3:12- CV-2671-CRB

1 Dated: 6/21/12

RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI LLP


2
3
4 By: 
5 David Kahn
6 Attorney for Defendant
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

7 Dated: June 21, 2012

8
9 By: 
10 Janelle Egger
11 Pro Se Plaintiff

12
13
14 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. The hearing currently on
15 calendar for Preliminary Injunction is rescheduled for Friday, July 13, 2012 at
16 10:00 a.m..

17 Dated: June 22, 2012

18
19 By: 
20 Charles R. Breyer
21 Senior District Judge

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO ADJUST BRIEFING SCHEDULE WITH
REGARD TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
CASE NO. 3:12- CV-2671-CRB

1 3. Since filing the Complaint on May 24, 2012 I have continued to pursue a political
2 solution to the Constitutional issues regarding Ordinance 2477 and the potential
3 countywide ordinance presented in the Complaint. I was therefore aware of and attended
4 meetings arranged by the County Administrative Officer (CAO), as directed by the Board
5 on January 17. I also was aware that discussions at these meetings included the potential
6 countywide ordinance and Ordinance 2477.

7 4. I received the Defendant's response as scheduled on Thursday, June 14, 2012. At
8 that time I expected, based on communication with the County Administrative Office
9 staff, that the potential countywide ordinance would probably be on the following
10 Tuesday's Humboldt Board of Supervisor's meeting agenda. I also believed based on
11 information from the meetings mentioned above that Ordinance 2477 might also be
12 discussed. I was able to access the Board Agenda on-line the evening of Friday June 15.
13 The Agenda item "Ordinance on Uses of County Properties" was listed under Item H,
14 Department Reports. The board report, authored by the CAO, also discussed Ordinance
15 2477.

16 5. I attended the June 19, 2012 Board meeting. Following a lengthy discussion a
17 motion was passed to direct staff to come back with a proposed ordinance changing some
18 language in Ordinance 2477. Talking with other members of the public, there was some
19 confusion as to which Ordinance language was included in the motion so I accompanied
20 Gay Gilchrist in a visit to the Clerk to the Board's office. There I learned a written draft
21 of the motion may be available today, but the motion wording would not be final until
22 presented to the Board and approved at next Tuesday's meeting. This presents difficulty
23 in replying to item 2b in the Defendant's response and may influence my reply to other
24 areas of the Defendant's response.

25 6. On June 21, 2012, the parties stipulated to a briefing schedule. This briefing
26 schedule fully complies with Rule 7-3 of Local Rules.
27
28

1 7. On June 7, 2012 there was a Stipulated Request for Order Changing Time, granted
2 June 12, 2012.

3 8. The requested time modification would not have any significant impact on the
4 schedule for this case, including the July hearing date on the Motion for preliminary
5 injunction.
6

7 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
8 forgoing is true and correct. Executed on June 21, 2012, at Fortuna, California.
9

10
11 
12 JANELLE EGGER
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

3 **Case name:** Janelle Egger v. County of Humboldt
4 **Case number:** 3:12-CV-2671-CRB

5 **What documents were served?**

6 Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Adjust Briefing Schedule with regard to Plaintiff's Motion
7 for Preliminary Injunction

8 and

9 Declaration of Janelle Egger in support of Stipulated Request for Order Changing Time

10 **How was the document served?**

- 11 ☐ Placed in U. S. Mail
12 ☐ Sent by fax
13 ☐ Hand-delivered
14 ☐ Sent by email or electronic transmission, based on agreement of the parties. I
15 caused the documents to be sent at the email addresses listed below. I did not
16 receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or
17 other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.


18 **To whom was the document delivered?**

19 RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN SAKAI LLP
20 350 Sansome Street, Suite 300
21 San Francisco, CA 94104
22 Telephone: (415) 678-3800
23 e-mail: ayang@publiclawgroup.com

24 **When were the documents served?**

25 Date: June 21 2012

26 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
27 information in this certificate of service is true and correct.

28 
Janelle Egger

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE