

1 MAYER BROWN LLP
 2 DALE J. GIALI (SBN 150382)
 3 *dgiali@mayerbrown.com*
 4 KERI E. BORDERS (SBN 194015)
 5 *kborders@mayerbrown.com*
 6 350 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor
 7 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1503
 8 Telephone: (213) 229-9500
 9 Facsimile: (213) 625-0248

10 Attorneys for Defendants
 11 Plum, PBC d/b/a Plum Organics (erroneously sued
 12 as Plum Inc.) and Campbell Soup Company

13 [Additional Party on Signature Page]

14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

KATHRYN WORKMAN, on behalf of herself
 and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PLUM INC., D/B/A PLUM ORGANICS, and
 CAMPBELL SOUP COMPANY,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:15-cv-02568-WHA

**STIPULATION SETTING
 DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE DATE TO
 THE COMPLAINT**

Complaint Filed: June 9, 2015

1 Plaintiff Kathryn Workman (“Plaintiff”) and defendants Plum, PBC d/b/a Plum Organics
2 (erroneously sued as Plum Inc.) and Campbell Soup Company (“Defendants”) (collectively, the
3 “Parties”), by and through their respective counsel of record and pursuant to Local Rule 6-2,
4 enter into the following stipulation extending the time in which Defendants must respond to the
5 complaint and setting a schedule on a motion to dismiss:

6 WHEREAS, on June 9, 2015, plaintiff filed the Complaint in the above-captioned action;

7 WHEREAS, on June 11, 2015, the Complaint was served on defendants (Dkt. Nos. 12,
8 13);

9 WHEREAS, based on the June 11, 2015 service, defendants’ response to the Complaint
10 was due on July 2, 2015;

11 WHEREAS, shortly after service of the Complaint, and based on the unique record
12 presented, the Parties began discussions about the potential for an early resolution of this action;

13 WHEREAS, on July 1, 2015, prior to the expiration of defendants’ time to respond to the
14 Complaint, the Parties submitted a stipulation for a limited ninety (90) day stay of this action
15 (Dkt. No 14) to commence discussions regarding an early resolution of this action;

16 WHEREAS, on July 23, 2015, and following assignment of the case to the Honorable
17 William H. Alsup, the Parties re-submitted their stipulation for a limited ninety (90) day stay of
18 this action to this Court (Dkt. No. 21);

19 WHEREAS, on July 24, 2015, the Court denied the stipulation for a limited ninety (90)
20 days stay of this action (Dkt. No. 22);

21 WHEREAS, the Parties now wish to set August 27, 2015, twenty-one (21) days from the
22 date of the filing of this stipulation, as the deadline for defendants to respond to the Complaint;

23 WHEREAS, the parties would like to use this opportunity also to set forth a briefing
24 schedule for Defendants’ anticipated motion to dismiss that allows the parties sufficient time;

25 WHEREAS, the Parties have not previously sought an extension to the time to respond to
26 the Complaint.

27 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between
28 the Parties through their respective counsel, subject to the approval from the court, that:

- 1 1. Defendants shall respond to the complaint by August 27, 2015.
2 2. Plaintiff shall file their opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss by September
3 25, 2015.
4 3. Defendants' reply shall be filed by October 8, 2015.
5 4. The motion shall be noticed for an ~~October 15~~^{October 29}, 2015 hearing date, or on such
6 other date and time that is convenient for the Court and its calendar.

7 DATED: August 5, 2015

MAYER BROWN LLP
Dale J. Giali
Keri E. Borders

8
9
10
11 By: /s/ Dale J. Giali
Dale J. Giali
Attorneys for Defendants
12 Plum, PBC d/b/a Plum Organics (erroneously
13 sued as Plum Inc.) and Campbell Soup
Company

14 DATED: August 5, 2015

DENLEA & CARTON LLP
Jeffrey I. Carton
Robert J. Berg

CALDWELL LESLIE & PROCTOR, PC
Robyn C. Crowther
Lennette W. Lee
Cameron J. Johnson

15
16
17
18
19
20 By: /s/ Robyn C. Crowther
Robyn C. Crowther
21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Kathryn Workman

22 **ATTESTATION**

23 I, Dale J. Giali, hereby attest, pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local. Rule 5.1(i)(3), that
24 concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each signatory.

25
26 By: /s/ Dale J. Giali
27
28


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
28

PROPOSED ORDER

Pursuant to stipulation, it is **SO ORDERED** that:

1. Defendants shall respond to the complaint by August 27, 2015.
2. Plaintiff shall file their opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss by September 25, 2015.
3. Defendants' reply shall be filed by October 8, 2015.
4. The motion shall be noticed for an ~~October 15~~^{October 29}, 2015 hearing date, or on such other date and time that is convenient for the Court and its calendar.

DATED: August 11, 2015.



HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP
United States District Judge