San Francisco Baykeeper v. Taylor

Doc. 11

WHEREAS, on December 18, 2015, Plaintiff San Francisco Baykeeper ("Plaintiff") filed the above-entitled action:

WHEREAS, Defendant has chosen to proceed as a *pro se* litigant, and has not appeared in this action:

WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Defendant (collectively, the "Parties") have been working together in good faith to reach a settlement agreement in this action;

WHEREAS, pursuant to a request by Plaintiff (Dkt. 5), the Court set the initial Case Management Conference in this action for May 5, 2016 at 10:00 a.m., and continued other deadlines in the case (Dkt. 6);

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to continue informal negotiations in good faith, and anticipate reaching a final settlement in this action within the next ten (10) weeks;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to reschedule the Case Management Conference for July 7, 2016, at 10:00 a.m., or at such later date that is convenient for the Court, in order to give the Parties a chance to complete settlement negotiations without involving the resources of the Court;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to reschedule the deadline to file the Parties' ADR certifications and stipulations to ADR process or notices of need for an ADR phone conference no later than one week before the Case Management Conference;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to reschedule the deadline to file the Parties' Rule 26(f) Report and Joint Case Management Statement no later than one week before the Case Management Conference;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to reschedule the deadline to file the Parties' initial disclosures or objections in their Rule 26(f) Report no later than one week before the Case Management Conference;

WHEREAS, pursuant to a request filed by Plaintiff (Dkt. 8), the Court extended Defendant's time to respond to the complaint to until May 23, 2016 (Dkt. 9);

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to extend the time for Defendant to respond to the complaint until July 11, 2016;

WHEREAS, such an extension of time within which to answer or otherwise respond to the complaint will not alter the date of any event or any deadline already fixed by Court Order;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to extend the time for Defendant to respond to the complaint to July 11, 2016, in order to give the Parties a chance to complete settlement negotiations;

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court to approve and enter the Proposed Order below.

DATE: April 25, 2016 Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Nicole C. Sasaki

Nicole C. Sasaki Attorneys for Plaintiff SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER
2	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING,
3	1. The Case Management Conference shall be continued toJuly 7, 2016
4	at 10:00 a.m.
5	2. The Parties' ADR certifications and stipulations to ADR process or notices of need for
6	an ADR phone conference shall be filed no later than one week before the Case
7	Management Conference.
8	3. The Parties' Rule 26(f) Report and Joint Case Management Statement shall be filed no
9	later than one week before the Case Management Conference.
10	4. The Parties' initial disclosures or objections in their Rule 26(f) Report shall be filed no
11	later than one week before the Case Management Conference.
12	5. Defendant's time to respond to the complaint shall be extended to July 11, 2016.
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.
14	
15	Date: April 26, 2016 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16	
17	Honorable Maria-Elena James
18	United States District Court
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

SECOND REQUEST TO CONTINUE CMC & TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT -- Civil No. 4:15-cv-05825-MEJ