26

27

28

THOMAS M. HARRELSON (CA Bar No. 114346) HARRELSON & ASSOCIATES 2 533 Airport Boulevard, Suite 325 Burlingame, CA 94010 3 Telephone: 650/373-3300 Facsimile: 650/373-3302 4 Attorneys for Defendant Joseph B. Iffla, Performex Machining Co., & Performex Machining, Inc. 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 Case No.: C 12-6490 WHO 9 GREENMARC, LLC, et al. 10 STIPULATION RE: EXTENSION OF Plaintiffs, TIME FOR RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT AND OTHER PRE-CMC 11 **DEADLINES** v. 12 JOSEPH B. IFFLA, ET AL., et al.; 13 14 Defendants. 15 16 The undersigned parties ("Parties"), by and through their attorneys, hereby stipulate 17 as follows: 18 1. The Parties submit this proposed Stipulation in lieu of an additional Joint Case 19 Management Statement as required by the Reassignment Order and Order Requiring 20 Submission of Case Management Statement; 2.1 2. The Parties, in addition to their meet and confer obligations, have engaged in 22 informal settlement discussions and document exchange. A technical report documenting 23 assessment of environmental conditions and remedy alternatives with regard to the subject 24 property at 1007 and 1011 Bransten Road in San Carlos, California has been circulated by 25 Plaintiff and has provided the foundation for further settlement discussions, cost allocation,

and formulation of a case discovery plan. In addition, the Parties have agreed to an early

of an evaluator that has not conflicts with any of the Parties hereto. The Parties have

neutral evaluation through the District Court's ADR program and are awaiting the selection

2.1

tentatively agreed to solicit communications with the San Mateo County Health Department in which Plaintiff has voluntarily been participating in monitoring activities to determine whether the County will require further remediation and if so, in what form it may take.

In order to afford the Parties additional time to continue to evaluate and discuss their settlement options and in the interest of judicial economy, the Parties agree that continuance of various case deadlines are in the interests of the Parties and the Court. The Parties believe that such considerations are more properly made prior to an initial case management conference ("CMC").

- 3. Accordingly, the Parties agree to the following extensions of upcoming Court deadlines:
- A. An the initial CMC was scheduled for June 28, 2013, at 2:30 p.m. before the Honorable Susan Illston in Courtroom No. 10 on the Nineteenth Floor of the Federal Building. That CMC never took place due to the reassignment of the matter to Judge Orrick. Now that this case has been reassigned to Judge William H. Orrick, the Parties respectfully request the scheduling of an initial CMC before Judge Orrick for late September or October, 2013 and subject to the calendar availability of Judge Orrick. This extension also considers the vacation schedules of counsel;
- B The time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint (ECF No.1) shall be further extended from the current agreed upon date of July 17, 2013 to September 25, 2013;
- C. The Parties have previously submitted and filed the Rule 26(f) Report, have completed their initial disclosures, and filed their initial Case Management Statement. The Parties agree to provide a joint supplemental Rule 26(f) Report and a supplemental joint Case Management Report after the Parties have continued their settlement discussions and ADR/ENE session and all prior to the upcoming to be scheduled CMC before Judge Orrick.
- D. The Parties agree to extend the ENE deadline for completion to the week of October 21, 2013. The last proposed ENE neutral, Jane Pandell, Esq. was objected to by

1	Defendant Iffla due to a conflict arising out of a prior employment relationship between Ms.	
2	Pandell's Firm and counsel for Mr. Iffla. A new ENE neutral has not yet been assigned.	
3	4. The terms of the Case Management Conference Order filed February 28, 2013 (ECF	
4	No. 10), the Stipulation filed on March 27, 2013 (ECF No. 12), the Stipulation filed on May	
5	6, 2013 (ECF No. 27) will otherwise remain in effect.	
6		
7	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
8 9	Dated:	LAW OFFICES OF KARL R. MORTHOLE
10 11		Karl R. Morthole, Attorney for PLAINTIFF
12	Dated:	HARRELSON & ASSOCIATES
14 15 16 17		Thomas M. Harrelson, Attorney for Defendants JOSEPH B. IFFLA, individually and dba PERFORMEX MACHINING COMPANY, and PERFORMEX MACHINING, INC.
18 19 20	Dated:	BARG COFFIN LEWIS & TRAPP, LLP
21 22		Joshua A. Bloom, Attorney for Defendant CARL R. HEINEMAN, individually
23 24	Dated:	PIERCE & SHEARER LLP
25 26 27 28		Stacy Y. North, Attorney for Defendants HOFFMAN METAL PRODUCTS, INC., and HARRY W. HOFFMAN, individually and as an officer, director and owner of HOFFMAN METAL PRODUCTS
	I	