

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. ARNOLD, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB
COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. C12-6426 TEH

ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
ORDER SHORTENING TIME

12 On February 28, 2013, Defendant Bristol-Myers Squibb Company filed a motion to
13 stay proceedings pending possible transfer by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation
14 and pending possible relation of this case by Judge Edward M. Chen to *Caouette v.*
15 *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, Case No. 12-1814 EMC, and other cases pending before him.
16 Defendant also filed a motion for an order shortening time on the motion to stay but failed to
17 request any specific timeline. Plaintiffs filed neither an opposition nor a statement of non-
18 opposition to the request to shorten time.

19 Upon careful consideration, the Court does not find good cause to shorten time on
20 Defendant's motion to stay. Accordingly, Defendant's motion to do so is DENIED.
21 However, the Court will not rule on Plaintiffs' pending motion to remand until after it has
22 first considered the motion to stay.

23
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25
26 Dated: 03/06/13



27
28
THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT