26

27

28

litigation resumed.

WHEREAS, on April 6, 2016, Plaintiffs filed this action against Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. ("Chase") in the California Superior Court, San Mateo County; WHEREAS, May 9, 2016, Chase removed this action to this Court; WHEREAS on July 21, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC"); WHEREAS, on July 14, 2016, Plaintiffs submitted a loan modification application to Chase for consideration; WHEREAS, on July 22, 2016, the parties stipulated to stay this action for 90 days pending the outcome of Plaintiffs' loan modification review; WHEREAS, on July 22, 2016, the Court entered the stay, and ordered the parties to submit a status report within 90 days, advising the Court of (a) the status of Plaintiffs' loan modification application; and the (b) the parties' positions on whether the stay should remain in force or active litigation resumed. WHEREAS, although Plaintiffs' loan modification review process remains ongoing, the parties remain optimistic that this litigation may be resolved informally in the event Chase grants Plaintiffs' application for loan modification. NOW THEREFORE, Plaintiffs and Chase HEREBY STIPULATE AND AGREE AS **FOLLOWS:** 1. The stay entered by the Court on July 22, 2016 shall remain in force to allow loan modification discussions to continue. 2. Within ninety (90) days of the Court's entry of this stipulation, the parties shall file a joint status report indicating (a) the status of Plaintiffs' loan modification application, and (b) the parties' positions on whether the stay should remain in place or should be lifted and active

3. Chase shall have twenty (20) days from the date of any order lifting the stay to answer, move to dismiss, or otherwise respond to the FAC.

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
2	DATED: October 19, 2016 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
3	Joseph E. Addiego III
4	John D. Freed
5	By: <u>/s/ John D. Freed</u> John D. Freed
6	Attorneys for Defendant
7	JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.
8	MELLEN LAW FIRM Eunji Cho
9	By: /s/ Eunji Cho
10	Eunji Cho
11	One Embarcadero Center, Fifth Floor
12	San Francisco, CA 94111 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
13	
14	
15	
16	<u>CERTIFICATION OF CONCURRENCE</u>
17	Pursuant to L.R. 5-1, I hereby attest that Eunji Cho, counsel for Plaintiffs Wayne and
18	Gladys Chan, has provided her concurrence in the electronic filing of the foregoing document
19	entitled STIPULATION TO EXTEND STAY OF ACTION PENDING LOAN MODIFICATION
20	REVIEW.
21	
22	/s/ John D. Freed
23	John D. Freed
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Presently before the Court is the parties' Stipulation to Extend Stay of Action Pending Loan Modification Review. Good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS the stipulation to permit the parties to pursue loan modification as an alternative to litigation. Accordingly, the stay imposed on July 22, 2016 remains in place.

On or before ninety (90) days after the Court's issuance of this Order, the parties shall submit a joint status report advising the Court of (a) the status of Plaintiff's loan modification application, and (b) the parties' positions on whether the stay should remain in force or active litigation resumed.

Chase shall have twenty (20) days from the date of any order lifting the stay in this case to answer, move to dismiss, or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

SO ORDERED . The CMC is reset from 11/10/16 to 1/26/17 at 9:30 a.m.

A joint CMC statement shall be filed by 1/19/17.

