1 MICHAEL T. RISHER (SB# 191627)
   mrisher@aclunc.org
2 LINDA LYE (SB# 215584)
   llye@aclunc.org
3 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
   FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA, INC.
4 39 Drumm Street
   San Francisco, CA 94111
5 Telephone: (415) 621-2493
   Facsimile: (415) 255-8437
6
   HANNI FAKHOURY (SB# 252629)
7 hanni@eff.org
   LEE TIEN (SB# 148216)
8 tien@eff.org
9 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
   454 Shotwell Street
10 San Francisco, CA 94110
   Telephone: (415) 436-9333
11 Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
13 JOHN DOE, *et al*.
   on behalf of themselves and others similarly
14 situated

15

16   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

17   **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18

19 JOHN DOE, *et al*., on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,)	Civil Case No. 3:12-CV-05713-TEH
20 Plaintiffs,)	**Stipulation and [~~proposed~~] order extending time for**
21 v.)	**City of Alameda to respond to Complaint and re: City's desire not to participate in**
22 KAMALA D. HARRIS, *et al*.,)	**litigation over plaintiffs' motions for preliminary injunction, to proceed**
23 Defendants.)	**anonymously, for partial sealing, and for provisional class certification**
24)	
25)	

26

27

28

STIP. AND PROPOSED ORDER TO EXTEND TIME ETC.
CASE NO.: 3:12-cv-05713-TEH

Plaintiffs and the Defendant City of Alameda ["City"] wish to extend the time for the City to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the complaint for a period of 90 days from the date of filing this matter, in order to expedite litigation and to avoid the unnecessary expenditure of resources by the City. This case was filed, and the City served, on November 7, 2012. This change will not alter the date of any event or any deadline already fixed by Court order.

For these same reasons, Defendant City of Alameda wishes not to be involved in litigation over the following: the TRO or preliminary injunction, since Plaintiffs do not seek such relief directly against the City; provisional class certification for the purposes of preliminary injunctive relief; whether Plaintiffs Doe and Roe may proceed anonymously; or whether the Doe and Roe declarations, or other declarations that may be submitted relating to provisional class certification or preliminary injunctive relief, may be partially sealed.

IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED:

1. The time period for Defendant City of Alameda to answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint is extended to and including February 5, 2013.

2. The City of Alameda does not wish to be heard on, or participate in, matters relating to

   a. the TRO or preliminary injunction, since Plaintiffs do not seek such relief directly against the City,

   b. provisional class certification for the purposes of preliminary injunctive relief,

   c. whether Plaintiffs Doe and Roe may proceed anonymously, or

   d. whether the Doe and Roe declarations, or other declarations relating to provisional class certification or preliminary injunctive relief, may be partially sealed.

This stipulation is without prejudice to the City's right to move for decertification or modification of any class under Rule 23(d), and to the City's right to oppose class certification for any other purpose or in any other context in this action. The City does not hereby waive or forfeit any such rights, arguments, or defenses, in this regard.

This stipulation is without prejudice to any rights, arguments, or defenses the City has or may assert in this action, and the City does not hereby waive or forfeit any such rights, arguments, or defenses.

As required by Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the undersigned filer attests that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other Signatory.

November 14, 2012

/S/ Michael T. Risher

Attorney for Plaintiffs

/S/ Farimah Faiz

Attorney for Defendant

City of Alameda

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:_01/16/2013_____

THE _____ DGE
UNIT _____ URT

Judge Thelton E. Henderson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

2