

1 Tammy B. Webb (SBN 227593)  
 tbwebb@shb.com  
 2 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
 One Montgomery, Suite 2700  
 3 San Francisco, California 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 544-1900  
 4 Facsimile: (415) 391-0281

5 Steven A. Zalesin (Admitted pro hac vice)  
 sazalesin@pbwt.com  
 6 PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER LLP  
 1133 Avenue of the Americas  
 7 New York, New York 10036-6710  
 Telephone: (212) 336-2000  
 8 Facsimile: (212) 336-2222

9 Attorneys for Defendants  
 10 THE COCA-COLA COMPANY and  
 COCA-COLA REFRESHMENTS USA, INC.

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 13

14 AYANNA NOBLES and JULIA HUGHES,  
 individually and on behalf of all others  
 15 similarly situated,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 COCA-COLA REFRESHMENTS USA, INC.,  
 and THE COCA-COLA COMPANY

19 Defendants.  
 20  
 21

Case No. 3:13-cv-05017-SI

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~  
 ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO FILE  
 RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
 COMPLAINT AND REQUESTING  
 CONTINUANCE OF INITIAL CASE  
 MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

22 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6.1(b), Plaintiffs Ayanna Nobles and Julia Hughes (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendants The Coca-Cola Company and Coca-Cola Refreshments USA, Inc., (“Defendants”) (collectively referred to as the “Parties”) through their respective counsel hereby stipulate as follows:

26 WHEREAS, on November 18, 2013, Defendants filed a motion to relate case with  
 27 Engurasoff v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al., Case No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW (“Engurasoff”) (Dkt.  
 28 No. 10);

1 WHEREAS, as set forth in that motion, Plaintiff's Complaint arises from the same set of  
2 operative facts as the Engurasoff complaint;

3 WHEREAS, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss in Engurasoff on November 22, 2013;

4 WHEREAS, Defendants believe that Plaintiff's Complaint is not legally viable for the same  
5 reasons asserted in its motion to dismiss in the Engurasoff action; WHEREAS, the deadline for  
6 Defendants to answer or otherwise move with respect to the Complaint is currently December 30,  
7 2013;

8 WHEREAS, the Initial Case Management Conference is currently set for February 5, 2014;

9 WHEREAS, no other time modifications have been made to this case, whether by stipulation  
10 or court order.

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the Parties through  
12 their respective attorneys of record that:

- 13 1. The deadline for Defendants to respond to the Complaint is extended to two weeks after a  
14 ruling is entered on the motion to dismiss filed in Engurasoffv. The Coca-Cola Company,  
15 et al., Case No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW, currently set to be heard on February 21, 2014.
- 16 2. The Initial Case Management Conference currently set for February 5, 2014 shall be  
17 continued to a later date, after a decision is made on the Engurasoff motion to dismiss.

18  
19 Dated: December 19, 2013

By: /s/ Reginald Von Terrell  
Reginald Von Terrell  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

20  
21  
22 Dated: December 19, 2013

By: /s/ Tammy B. Webb  
Tammy B. Webb  
Attorneys for Defendants

23  
24  
25 Pursuant to L.R. 5-11(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained  
26 from the other signatories.

27 By: /s/ Tammy B. Webb  
Tammy B. Webb

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2 The Court hereby orders that:

- 3 1. Defendants' response to the Complaint will be due two weeks after the decision is made  
4 on the motion to dismiss in Engurasoff, et al. v. The Coca-Cola Company, et al., Case  
5 No. 3:13-cv-03990-JSW.
- 6 2. The Initial Case Management Conference set for February 5, 2014 is continued to  
7 3/21/14 @ 2:30 P.M.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 Dated: 12/19/13



THE HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE