Ramirez v.	ounty of Alameda et al		Doc	29
1	THOMAS F. BERTRAND, State Bar No. 056560			
2	MICHAEL C. WENZEL, State Bar No. 215388 BERTRAND, FOX & ELLIOT			
3	The Waterfront Building			
	2749 Hyde Street			
4	San Francisco, California 94109 Telephone: (415) 353-0999			
5	Facsimile: (415) 353-0990			
6	mwenzel@bfesf.com			
7	Attorneys for Defendants			
8	ANTHONY MOSCHETTI			
	JOHN L. BURRIS, Esq., State Bar No. 69888			
9	DeWITT M. LACY, Esq., State Bar No. 258789			
10	THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS Airport Corporate Center			
11	7677 Oakport St., Suite 1120			
12	Oakland, CA 94621 T: (510) 839-5200			
13	F: (510) 839-3882			
	dewitt.lacy@johnburrislaw.com			
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
15	ELISA RAMIREZ, Guardian ad Litem for A.S., r	ninor		
16				
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
18	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
19	ELISA RAMIREZ, Guardian ad Litem for A.S.,	Case No. 3:12-cv-04852-MEJ		
20	minor,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		
21	Plaintiff,	CONTINUING MEDIATION COMPLIANCE DATE AND DISCOVERY/DISPOSITIVE		
22	v.	MOTION DEADLINES		
23	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, ALAMEDA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT, GREGORY			
24	AHERN, Sheriff,			
25	Defendants.			
26	Detenuants.	Hon. Maria-Elena James		
27		rion, Maria-Liena James		
28				
	CEIDIH AEION AND IBBODOGEDI ODDED CONTE	1		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING MEDIATION COMPLIANCE DATE AN DISCOVERYDISPOSITIVE MOTION DEADLINES			
	Ramirez v. County of Alameda, et al. U.S. District Court Case No. 3:12-cv-04852-MEJ			
	C.S. District Court Case 110. 3.12 ev 04032 ML9	Dockets.Ju	ustia.c	om

17

16

18 19

20

21

2223

2526

24

27

28

STIPULATION

Defendant ANTHONY MOSCHETTI, deputy sheriff for the County of Alameda, and plaintiff ELISA RAMIREZ, Guardian ad Litem for A.S., a minor by and through their respective attorneys of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

- 1. The initial Case Management Conference was scheduled for December 13, 2012. At the time of that initial conference, the COUNTY OF ALAMEDA and SHERIFF GREGORY AHERN were defendants to the matter. ANTHONY MOSCHETTI and SEARGENT K. RITTER had not been named. Pursuant to the Court's Case Management Order issued on December 10, 2012, the Case Management Conference was vacated and the following discovery and dispositive motion deadlines were set:
 - (A) Disclosure of Expert Witnesses and Expert Reports to be served by 9/13/2013;
 - (B) Disclosure of Rebuttal Expert Witnesses to be served by 9/23/2013;
 - (C) Non-Expert Discovery to be completed by 10/8/2013;
 - (D) All Dispositive Motions shall be filed, served, and noticed by 11/7/2013;
 - (E) The Court shall hear dispositive motions no later than 12/12/2013; and
 - (F) Trial is scheduled for 4/14/2014.
 - 2. On January 8, 2013, the parties were assigned to H. Jay Folberg for mediation.
- 3. By Order dated March 3, 2013, the Court approved the Parties' stipulation to continue the mediation compliance date until July 4, 2013.
- 4. At this time, due to the procedural history of this matter, defendant is unable to comply with the above deadlines for the following reasons:
- (a) The original Complaint named only the County and Sheriff Ahern as defendants. No individual deputies were named, although Doe defendants were named.
- (b) On December 19, 2012, previous defendants filed a motion to dismiss the only cause of action brought against the named defendants (the second claim for relief alleging a Monell claim). On January 23, 2013, the Court granted defendants' Motion to Dismiss, leaving no named defendants in the action, thereby preventing further discovery.
 - (c) Plaintiff did not file a First Amended Complaint by February 5, 2013, the deadline

set by the Court. On April 3, 2013, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a First Amended Complaint. By Order, the Court granted plaintiff's motion for leave to amend on April 19, 2013. The same day plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint to substitute SERGEANT K. RITTER and DEPUTY ANTHONY MOSCHETTI for Doe defendants. The First Amended Complaint has not been served on either defendant.

- (b) In an effort to expedite this matter, defense counsel obtained authorization and agreed to accept service of the First Amended Complaint on behalf of DEPUTY ANTHONY MOSCHETTI effective the day this Court signs the foregoing stipulation continuing currently set deadlines. Acceptance of service was predicated on plaintiff's counsel stipulating to a continuance of these dates because absent continuance of these deadlines, defendants would suffer extreme prejudice in their ability to conduct discovery and prepare for trial due to a lack of service of the First Amended Complaint. Counsel for defendant extended this offer in May of 2013, and several more times in June, July and August of 2013, but no agreement was obtained. Counsel for defendant is not authorized to accept service of the complaint on behalf of SERGEANT K. RITTER as he is no longer employed by the County of Alameda.
- (c) Previous defendant, County of Alameda, propounded written discovery on plaintiff on January 15, 2013. However, the County was dismissed from this action on January 23, 2013. Responses to the County's written discovery would have been due February 19, 2013. Accordingly, no further responses have been made to the County's propounded written discovery.
- (d) Because no named defendants in the action remained after the Court granted the Motion to Dismiss, plaintiff had no obligation to respond to remaining discovery previously propounded by County of Alameda. Defendants will need to re-serve discovery requests on behalf of the newly named individual defendants once served or upon signing of this stipulation. Defendant cannot depose plaintiff until service or the signing of this stipulation and until written discovery responses are received.
- (e) Plaintiff's counsel has been in back to back trials since July 9, 2013. Mr. Lacy appeared as counsel for Plaintiff in Williams v. City of Merced, case no. 1:10-cv-01999-MJS before the Honorable Michael J. Seng. Plaintiff's counsel also appeared in trial in another separate and unrelated

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- (f) Plaintiff's counsel has now agreed to submit the following stipulation regarding service of the complaint and a continuance of currently set deadlines. Upon the service of the First Amended Complaint in this matter, named defendants reserve all rights to move to dismiss the complaint on both substantive and procedural grounds.
- (g) A further extension of the mediation compliance date and related discovery/dispositive motion dates is therefore necessary to complete written discovery and take necessary depositions.
- 5. For all the good cause stated above, the parties respectfully request this Court extend the deadline to complete mediation from July 4, 2013 to January 18, 2014.
- 6. The parties further request the Court extend the currently set deadlines (other than the trial date) as set forth below.
 - (A) Disclosure of Expert Witnesses and Expert Reports to be served by 2/15/2014;
 - (B) Disclosure of Rebuttal Expert Witnesses to be served by 2/25/2014;
 - (C) Non-Expert Discovery to be completed by 4/3/2013;
 - (D) All Dispositive Motions shall be filed, served, and noticed by 5/3/2014;
 - (E) The Court shall hear dispositive motions no later than 7/6/2014
- 7. The parties further request the Court continue the trial date in this matter from April 14, 2014 to September 15, 2014.
- 8. Alternatively, the parties respectfully request this Court vacate all presently set dates and set a date for a case management conference to address scheduling issues.
- 9. The parties respectfully request that the Court approve this stipulation and incorporate its terms in an Order.

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
2	
3	Dated: THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS
4	
5	By: /s/ DeWitt Lacy DeWitt M. Lacy
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff
7	ELISA RAMIREZ, Guardian ad Litem for A.S., minor
8	
9	Dated: BERTRAND, FOX & ELLIOT
10	
11	By: /s/ Michael Wenzel Michael C. Wenzel
12	Attorneys for Defendant ANTHONY
13	MOSCHETTI
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	5 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING MEDIATION COMPLIANCE DATE AND DISCOVERYDISPOSITIVE MOTION DEADLINES Ramirez v. County of Alameda, et al. U.S. District Court Case No. 3:12-cv-04852-MEJ