Hightower et	al v. City and County of San Francisco et al	
	CHRISTINA A. DIEDOARDO	
1	Nevada Bar No. 9543	
2	California Bar No. 258714	
2	LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTINA DIEDOARDO	
3	201 Spear Street Suite 1100 San Francisco, CA 94105	
	(415) 839-5098	
4	Christina@diedoardolaw.com	
-	Attorney for Plaintiffs	
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
0	MITCH HIGHTOWER, OXANE "GYPSY")	Case No.: C 12-5841-EMC
8	TAUB, GEORGE DAVIS, RUSSELL MILLS,)	Stipulation and Order Setting Priofing
9	and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,)	Stipulation and Order Setting Briefing Schedule On Application for Preliminary
	Plaintiff,	Injunction
10	vs. / CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN /	5
11	FRANCISCO, DAVID CHIU in his official	
11	capacity only as President of the Board of	
12	Supervisors of the City and County of San	
	Francisco, SCOTT WEINER in his official	
13	capacity only as a member of the Board of	
14	Supervisors of the City and County of San)	
14	Francisco, and ANGELA CALVILLO, in her)	
15	official capacity only as Clerk of the Board of)	
	Supervisors,) Defendants.	
16	Defendants.	
17	Defendant)	
17)	
18	Stipulation and Order Setting Briefing Schedule On Application for Preliminary	
	<u>Injunction</u>	
19		
20	COMES NOW Plaintiffs, by and through their attorney of record Ms. Christina A.	
21	DiEdoardo, Esq., and Defendants, by and through their attorney of record Deputy City Attorney	
22	Tara M. Steely, and hereby stipulate and agree as follows:	
22	I and mi. Succey, and nereby supulate and agree as	5 10110 W 5.

1. Based on the assurance by counsel for Defendants that the proposed Ordinance which is the subject of this litigation could not become operative until January 3, 2013, at

25

23

24

Dockets.Justia.com

the earliest, and on the further assurance that Supervisor Wiener plans to amend the proposed Ordinance to provide that its operative date will be February 1, 2013, Plaintiffs voluntarily withdraw their request for a TRO. The parties agree that the "Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause Why Preliminary Injunction Should Not Issue" will be construed as an Application for a Preliminary Injunction.

- The Parties also agree that Defendants' response to the complaint shall be due on December 13, 2012 and their opposition brief to the Application for a Preliminary Injunction shall be due on December 20, 2012. Plaintiffs' reply brief shall be due on January 3, 2012. The Court shall conduct a hearing on said Application on January 17, 2013 at 1:30 p.m.
- All other orders not in conflict with this stipulation shall remain in full force and effect.

/s/Christina A. DíEdoardo Christina A. DiEdoardo California Bar No. 258714 Attorney for Plaintiffs

Date: Nov. 15. 2012

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

/S/<u>Tara M. Steeley</u> Tara M. Steeley California Bar No. 231775 Attorney for Defendants

Date: November 19, 2012

ORDER Based on the stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing, the Court will conduct a hearing on Plaintiff's Application for a Preliminary Injunction on January 17, 2013 at 1:30 p.m. Defendants shall have until December 20, 2012 to submit their opposition, and Plaintiffs shall have until January 3, 2013 to submit their reply. Defendants' response to the complaint shall be due on December 13, 2012. All prior orders not in conflict with this Order shall remain in full force and effect. IT IS SO ORDERED DISTR The Hon: E IT IS SO ORDERED United State ORNIA Judge Edward M. Chen ZO R DISTRI