Doc 62

Dockets.Justia.dom

Digby Adler Group LLC et al v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC

5

1011

1213

1415

16

1718

1920

22

21

2425

23

2627

28 Carroll, Burdick & By and through their attorneys of record, plaintiffs Digby Adler Group LLC and Benjamin Robles ("Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, and defendant Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC ("MBUSA") stipulate and agree as follows:

- 1. On April 14, 2014, Plaintiff Digby Adler filed this putative class action in San Francisco County Superior Court. MBUSA was served with the summons and complaint on April 21, 2014. On May 21, 2014, MBUSA removed the case from San Francisco County Superior Court to this Court on the basis of diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331(a)(1) and 1331(d)(2)(A).
- 2. On April 28, 2015, Plaintiff Digby Adler filed a Third Amended Complaint ("TAC") [Dkt. 41]. On May 26, 2015, MBUSA filed a motion to dismiss the TAC [Dkt. 46]. Plaintiffs filed a response on June 16, 2015 [Dkt. 50]. On September 1, 2015, the Court ruled on MBUSA's motion to dismiss the TAC, granting the motion in part and dismissing it in part [Dkt. 53].
- 3. On September 15, 2015, the Court granted the Parties' request to extend MBUSA's deadline to file its answer to the TAC until December 14, 2015 [Dkt. 56].
- 4. On December 11, 2015, the Parties filed a stipulation permitting Plaintiffs to file a Fourth Amended Complaint ("FAC") and requesting an extension of MBUSA's time to respond until 30 days after service of the FAC [Dkt. 58]. Plaintiffs filed and served the FAC on December 14, 2015 [Dkt. 59].
- 5. On December 15, 2015, the Court granted the Parties' request to extend MBUSA's deadline to file its answer to the FAC until January 13, 2016 [Dkt. 60].
- 6. The parties continue to make progress in resolving this case, and believe that it would conserve resources and enhance judicial efficiency to devote their attention to these efforts in the immediate future instead of preparing adversarial filings. Accordingly, counsel for the Parties have met and conferred and agree that MBUSA shall have until March 14, 2016 to file its response to the FAC.
- 7. A Case Management Conference is scheduled in this case for January 25, 2016. For the reasons stated above, the Parties agree that the Case Management Conference should be

1	continued until March 21, 2016.	
2	8. There are no other scheduled matters in this case. The requested time modification	
3	would have no effect on the schedule for the case other than as described herein.	
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
5	Dated: January 7, 2016 Re	espectfully submitted,
6	C_{ij}	ARROLL, BURDICK & McDONOUGH LLP
7	,	
8	By	y /s/ Troy Yoshino
9	- 11	Troy M. Yoshino
10		Attorneys for Defendant MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC
11		
12	Dated: January 7, 2016 Re	espectfully submitted,
13	TI	HE VEEN FIRM, P.C.
14	. CI	HAVEZ & GERTLER LLP
15		
16	By	
17	,	Dan L. Gildor Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class and
18		Subclasses
19		
20	L.R. 5-1(i)(3) Certification Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the filer of the document attests that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other Signatories	
21		
22		The other signatories
23	II .	
24	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED	
25		
26		
27	Dated: <u>01/11/2016</u>	By: Thelton E. Henderson
28		United States District Judge
&	CBM-MERCEDES\SF672029-1	2 Case No. 3:14-cy-02349 TEH

CARROLL, BURDICK & McDonough LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO