San Francisco Baykeeper v. Taylor

Doc. 14

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 second request by Plaintiff (Dkt. 10), the Court set the initial Case Management Conference in this action for July 7, 2016 at 10:00 a.m., and continued other deadlines in the case (Dkt. 11);

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to continue informal negotiations in good faith, and anticipate reaching a final settlement in this action within the next eight (8) weeks;

WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests, upon the Court's approval, to reschedule the Case Management Conference for August 18, 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 second request filed by Plaintiff (Dkt. 10), the Court extended Defendant's time to respond to the complaint to until July 11, 2016 (Dkt. 11);

WHEREAS, the Parties desire to extend the time for Defendant to respond to the complaint until August 22, 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 August 22, 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: June 24, 2016 Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Nicole C. Sasaki

Nicole C. Sasaki Attorneys for Plaintiff SAN FRANCISCO BAYKEEPER

(PROPOSED) ORDER

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING,

- 1. The Case Management Conference shall be continued to July 25, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.
- The Parties' ADR certifications and stipulations to ADR process or notices of need for an ADR phone conference shall be filed no later than one week before the Case Management Conference.
- 3. The Parties' Rule 26(f) Report and Joint Case Management Statement shall be filed no later than one week before the Case Management Conference.
- 4. The Parties' initial disclosures or objections in their Rule 26(f) Report shall be filed no later than one week before the Case Management Conference.
- Defendant's time to respond to the complaint shall be extended to August 22, 2016.
 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: ____ June 24, 2016

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Honorable Maria-Elena James United States District Court

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