1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARL SHELTON

v.

Plaintiff(s)

PATRICK J. MULLIGAN and THE MULLIGAN LAW FIRM Defendant(s).

Case No. 3:15-CV-02555-JCS

STIPULATION EXTENDING DEFENDANTS' DEADLINE TO ANSWER AND/OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Pursuant to Local Rule 6-1, Defendants Patrick J. Mulligan and the Mulligan Law Firm ("Defendants") hereby file this Stipulation Extending Defendants' Deadline to Answer and/or Otherwise Respond to Plaintiff's Original Complaint, informing the Court of the Parties' agreement to extend the deadline for Defendants to answer/otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint until Friday, February 19, 2016, and stating as follows:

Defendants were served on January 28, 2016, yet the return of service filed with the Court appears

1.

to indicate incorrectly that they were served on January 26, 2016.¹ See ECF No. 16.

2. To eliminate any confusion, Defendants' counsel conferred with Plaintiff by telephone on Monday, February 15, 2016, and Plaintiff agreed to allow Defendants until Friday, February 19, 2016 to answer or otherwise respond to his Complaint.

3. This extension of time from February 16, 2016 to February 19, 2016 will not affect the schedule in this case or alter the date of any event or any deadline already fixed by Court order. Consequently, in compliance with Local Rule 6-1, Defendants file this stipulation informing the Court of the parties' agreement.

Respectfully submitted, illit , r DISTR Dated: 2/18/16 Jeffrey M. Tillotson, P.C. California Bar No. 139372 IT IS SO ORDERED **ILLOTSON LAW** 50 N. St. Paul Street, Suite 610 Dallas, Texas 75201 Judge Joseph C. Spero ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS PATRICK J. MULLIGAN AND THE MULLIGAN LAW FIRM DISTRIC

¹ The handwritten date on the return of service is not clear.

28