1 2 3 4 5 6	HAEGGQUIST & ECK, LLP AMBER L. ECK (177882) 225 Broadway, Suite 2050 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 342-8000 Email: ambere@haelaw.com ROSE LAW GROUP, PC KATHRYN HONECKER (pro hac vice) 7144 E. Stetson Drive, Suite 300 Scottsdale, AZ 85251	
7 8	Telephone: (480) 505-3936 Email: khonecker@roselawgroup.com	
9	[Additional Counsel Appear on Signature Page]	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION VILLIAM RUSHING, Individually and on ehalf of all Others Similarly Situated, Plaintiff, V. VILLIAMS-SONOMA, INC., et al., Defendants. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT Case No.: 3:16-cv-01421-WHO CLASS ACTION STIPULATION REGARDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT Assigned to the Honorable William H. Orrick Courtroom: 2	
2021222324		Date: May 16, 2018 Time: 2:00 p.m. Complaint Filed: January 29, 2016 Action Removed: March 23, 2016 7 th Amd. Complaint Filed: April 4, 2017 Trial Date: None Set
25262728		

TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Pursuant to Northern District of California Local Rules 6-1, 6-2, and 7-12, Plaintiff William Rushing ("Plaintiff") and Defendants Williams-Sonoma, Inc., Williams-Sonoma DTC, Inc., and Williams-Sonoma Advertising, Inc. (collectively "Defendants"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby respectfully stipulate and jointly request that the Court approve the briefing schedule agreed upon by the parties regarding Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment ("MSJ"), as set forth below.

RECITALS

On April 10, 2018, Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment with a hearing date of May 16, 2018. Dkt. 119.

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of the Northern District of California, and the deadlines set forth on CM-ECF, Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' MSJ is due by April 24, 2018, and Defendants' Reply is due by May 1, 2018.

Plaintiff has requested additional time to potentially conduct discovery and respond to Defendants' MSJ. Since that extension would cause the Reply date to conflict with Memorial Day, the parties have agreed upon a briefing schedule which accommodates Plaintiff's request and the Memorial Day holiday, subject to the Court's approval.

STIPULATION

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties, by and through their respective counsel, that the briefing schedule on Defendants' MSJ shall be revised as follows:

- 1. May 18, 2018 Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' MSJ;
- 2. June 1, 2018 Defendants' Reply in support of their MSJ; and
- 3. June 13, 2018 Hearing on MSJ.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: April 18, 2018 HAEGGQUIST & ECK, LLP AMBER L. ECK (177882)

By: /s/Amber L. Eck
AMBER L. ECK

Case No. 3:16-cv-01421-WHO - STIPULATION REGARDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1	SIGNATURE APPROVAL	
2	The filing attorney attests that she has obtained concurrence regarding the filing of this	
3	document from the signatories to this document.	
4	Dated: April 18, 2018	
5	/s/Amber L. Eck AMBER L. ECK	
6	AWIDER L. ECK	
7	* * *	
8	ORDER	
9	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED as modified below.	
10	The briefing schedule on Defendants' MSJ shall be revised as follows:	
11	1. May 18, 2018 – Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' MSJ;	
12	2. June 1, 2018 – Defendants' Reply in support of their MSJ; and	
13	3. June 20 , 2018 – Hearing on MSJ.	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	1.1. 11 00	
16	Dated: April 18, 2018	
17	THE HUNORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
	Case No. 3:16-cv-01421-WHO - STIPULATION REGARDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	