

1 Cliff Palefsky (SBN 77683)
 Keith Ehrman (SBN 106985)
 2 MCGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY
 3 535 Pacific Avenue
 San Francisco, CA 94133
 4 Telephone: (415) 421-9292
 Facsimile: (415) 403-0202
 5 CP@mhpsf.com
 keith@mhpsf.com
 6

7 Michael Rubin (SBN 80618)
 Connie K. Chan (SBN 284230)
 Raphael N. Rajendra (SBN 255096)
 8 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
 177 Post Street, Suite 300
 9 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Telephone: (415) 421-7151
 10 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064
 mrubin@altber.com
 11 cchan@altber.com
 rrajendra@altber.com
 12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

13 Mark G. Kisicki, Esq. (SBN 150057)
 OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART
 14 Esplanade Center III, Suite 800
 2415 East Camelback Road
 15 Phoenix, AZ 85016
 Telephone: (602) 778-3700
 16 Facsimile: (602) 778-3750
 Mark.Kisicki@ogletreedeakins.com
 17 *Attorney for Defendant*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 PETER SCHUMAN, an individual, and
 WILLIAM COPLIN, an individual, on behalf
 21 of themselves and on behalf of others similarly
 22 situated,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 MICROCHIP TECHNOLOGY
 INCORPORATED, a corporation; ATMEL
 CORPORATION, a corporation; and ATMEL
 26 CORPORATION U.S. SEVERANCE
 GUARANTEE BENEFIT PROGRAM, an
 27 employee benefit plan,

28 Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-05544-HSG

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR
 EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

Hearing Date: February 9, 2017
 Time: 2:00pm
 Courtroom: 10
 Action Filed: September 29, 2016
 Trial Date: None

1 Defendants Microchip Technology Incorporated (“Microchip”), Atmel Corporation
2 (“Atmel”), and Atmel Corporation U.S. Severance Guarantee Benefit Program (“Severance
3 Program” and, collectively with Microchip and Atmel, “Defendants”) filed their Motion to
4 Dismiss Plaintiff’s Class Action Complaint and Motion to Dismiss Defendants Microchip and
5 Atmel Corporation U.S. Severance Guarantee Benefit Program as Defendants on November 16,
6 2016. Hearing on this motion is scheduled for February 17, 2017, at 2:00pm.

7 Plaintiffs Peter Schuman and William Coplin (collectively “Plaintiffs”) and Defendants
8 have agreed to extend the deadline for Plaintiffs to respond to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.
9 Plaintiff’s Opposition will be due on December 21, 2016. Defendants’ Reply will be due on
10 January 4, 2017.

11 Dated: November 29, 2016

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH,
SMOAK, & STEWART, P.C.
Attorneys for Defendants

12
13
14 By: /s/ Mark G. Kisicki


15 McGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY and
16 ALTSCHULER BERZON LLP
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

17
18 By: /s/ Cliff Palefsky

19 IT IS SO ORDERED that:

- 20 1. Plaintiff’s Opposition shall be filed no later than December 21, 2016; and
21 2. Defendant’s Reply shall be filed no later than January 4, 2017.
22

23 Dated: November 30, 2016


24 JUDGE HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
26 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
27
28