

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CAROL BENZ

Plaintiff(s),

CASE NO. C13-01361 WHO

v.

STIPULATION AND ORDER  
SELECTING ADR PROCESS

THE CLOROX COMPANY,

Defendant(s).

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

**Court Processes:**

- ☐ Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)
- ☐ Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)
- X Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

*(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)*

**Private Process:**

- ☐ Private ADR (please identify process and provider)

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

X the presumptive deadline (*The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.* )

- ☐ other requested deadline

Dated: 7-3-13

/s/ Dennis Woodruff

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: 7-8-13

/s/ Susan W. Pangborn


Attorney for Defendant

CONTINUE TO FOLLOWING PAGE

**ORDER**

- ☒ The parties' stipulation is adopted and IT IS SO ORDERED.  
☐ The parties' stipulation is modified as follows, and IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 07/10/2013

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. H. Orrick", written over a horizontal line.

Judge William H. Orrick  
UNITED STATES JUDGE

<p>When filing this document in ECF, please be sure to use the appropriate Docket Event, e.g., "Stipulation and Proposed Order Selecting Mediation."</p>
--