

The Court has received the letter dated March 17, 2016 from Darren Teshima, counsel for Plaintiffs Braden Partners, LP and Teijin Pharma USA, LLC. ECF No. 120. The letter requests that the Court adopt the case schedule attached to the letter.

Plaintiffs' ex parte request for relief is denied. A party seeking administrative relief should file a motion pursuant to Local Rule 7-11. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the Court does not adjudicate by letter.

20 Rather than soliciting a motion, however, the Court now orders the parties to meet and confer regarding an appropriate case schedule and to file a joint statement regarding the same, 21 22 either setting forth an agreed-upon schedule or making competing proposals. If any party 23 contends that further discovery is required, it must identify such discovery with specificity. For 24 example, a party contending that depositions are required should identify the name of the intended 25 deponent or deponents. If the parties submit competing schedules, the Court will endeavor to choose, in all respects, the single proposal it concludes is most reasonable. See Michael Carrell & 26 27 Richard Bales, Considering Final Offer Arbitration to Resolve Public Sector Impasses in Times of 28 Concession Bargaining, 28 Ohio St. J. on Disp. Resol. 1, 20 (2013) ("In baseball arbitration . . .

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

the parties . . . have every incentive to make a reasonable proposal to the arbitrator because the arbitrator will choose the more reasonable offer"). The joint statement is due by March 25, 2016 and must not exceed ten pages. The Court is aware that Defendant has filed a motion to stay the case. ECF No. 122. The joint statement due on March 25 should not address that motion. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: March 19, 2016 JON S United States District Judge 

United States District Court Northern District of California