

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
 Charles K. Verhoeven (CA Bar No. 170151)  
 2 Antonio R. Sistos (CA Bar No. 238847)  
 3 Emily C. O'Brien (CA Bar No. 240072)  
 Andrew M. Holmes (CA Bar No. 260475)  
 4 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
 San Francisco, California 94111  
 5 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700  
 6 Email: charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com  
 7 antoniosistos@quinnemanuel.com  
 emilyobrien@quinnemanuel.com  
 8 drewholmes@quinnemanuel.com

9 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP  
 Patrick Curran (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
 10 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
 New York, NY 10010  
 11 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
 12 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100  
 Email: patrickcurran@quinnemanuel.com

13 [Additional Counsel Listed on Complaint]  
 14

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff EMC Corporation*

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19  
 20 EMC CORPORATION,  
 21 Plaintiff,

22 vs.

23  
 24 BRIGHT RESPONSE, LLC,  
 25 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:12-cv-02841-EMC

**JOINT STIPULATION TO CONTINUE  
 THE BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR  
 DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO DISMISS  
 AND/OR TRANSFER**

[L.R. 6-1, 6-2, 7-12]

1 Pursuant to this Court's Order (Dkt. No. 39) and Civil Local Rules 6-1, 6-2, and 7-12,  
2 EMC Corporation ("EMC") and Bright Response, LLC ("Bright Response," and together with  
3 EMC the "Parties") respectfully declare and stipulate to continue the briefing schedule for Bright  
4 Response's motions to dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) as follows:

- 5 1. The due date for EMC's Oppositions to the Bright Response motions to  
6 dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) is continued from August 14,  
7 2012 to no later than August 21, 2012.
- 8 2. The due date for Bright Response's Replies in support of its motions to  
9 dismiss and/or transfer (Dkt. Nos. 23 and 25) is continued from August 21,  
10 2012 to no later than August 28, 2012.

11 The purpose for the extensions of time is to allow EMC to investigate the issues and  
12 allegations raised in Bright Response's motions. In accordance with Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(2),  
13 the only time modifications to the case thus far have been two stipulated extensions of time for  
14 Bright Response to respond to the complaint. (Dkt. Nos. 12 and 17.) In accordance with Civil  
15 Local Rule 6-2(a)(3), the Parties do not believe that the requested time modifications will have any  
16 impact on the case schedule as one has not yet been set.

17  
18 SO STIPULATED:

19 DATED: August 10, 2012

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

21 By /s/ Andrew M. Holmes  
22 Andrew M. Holmes

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff EMC Corporation*

24 DATED: August 10, 2012

BLACK CHANG & HAMILL LLP

26 By /s/ Bradford J. Black  
27 Bradford J. Black

28 *Attorneys for Defendant Bright Response, LLC*

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

**ATTESTATION**

I, Andrew M. Holmes, hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Bradford J. Black, counsel for Bright Response, LLC. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 10th day of August, 2012 in San Francisco, California.

By /s/ Andrew M. Holmes  
Andrew M. Holmes

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: 8/13/12

United States Dist

