Clevlen v. Anthera Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al

Doc. 24

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2 and 7-12, Lead Plaintiff Urešomir Čorak ("Plaintiff") and defendants Anthera Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Paul F. Truex, Craig Thompson, May Liu, and William Shanahan ("Defendants," and together with Plaintiff, the "Parties"), by and through their undersigned counsel of record, hereby stipulate to set the pleading and briefing schedule in the above-captioned action.

WHEREAS, on February 13, 2017, Brian Clevlen filed a complaint captioned *Brian Clevlen v. Anthera Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Paul F. Truex, Craig Thompson, May Liu, and William Shanahan*, No. 3:17-cv-00715-RS (the "Action"), a purported class action under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA") alleging violations of the federal securities laws;

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2017, the Court entered an order (Dkt. No. 14) approving the Parties' joint stipulation extending Defendants' time to respond to the complaint, vacating the Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines entered by the Court on February 14, 2017 (Dkt. No. 4), continuing all dates and deadlines pending disposition on Defendants' anticipated motion(s) to dismiss, and ordering that the Initial Case Management Conference shall be held thirty (30) days after an order directing Defendants to file an answer (if any), or as soon as possible thereafter consistent with the Court's schedule;

WHEREAS, on April 17, 2017, pursuant to the PSLRA, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Appointment as Lead Plaintiff and Approval of Counsel (Dkt. No. 16);

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2017, the Court entered an order (Dkt. No. 21) appointing Plaintiff as lead plaintiff; and approving Plaintiff's selection of Levi & Korsinsky LLP as lead counsel; and

WHEREAS, the Parties continue to believe that, because the PSLRA stays all discovery, including initial disclosures, pending the disposition of motions to dismiss in securities actions such as this one, it is appropriate to defer the initial case management conference and the completion of initial disclosures until the lead plaintiff has filed a consolidated amended complaint, Defendants have had the opportunity to file any motion to dismiss, and the Court has ruled on Defendants' anticipated motion to dismiss. *See, e.g., Medhekar v. United States Dist. Court*, 99 F.3d 325, 328-29 (9th Cir. 1996) (holding Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)'s initial disclosure requirements are disclosures

1	or other proceedings for purposes of PSLRA's stay provision, and must be stayed pending		
2	disposition of motion to dismiss);		
3	NOV	V, THEREFORE, the Parties stipulate and agree, subject to the Court's approval, as	
4	follows:		
5	1.	Defendants need not answer, move against or otherwise respond to the complaint in	
6	the Action u	antil Plaintiff files or designates an operative complaint;	
7	2.	Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint, which will function as the operative	
8	complaint, or designate an existing complaint as the operative complaint, on or before July 17		
9	2017;		
10	3.	Defendants shall answer, move against, or otherwise respond to the operative	
11	complaint on or before September 15, 2017;		
12	4.	If Defendants move to dismiss the operative complaint, Plaintiff shall file any	
13	opposition p	papers on or before November 15, 2017;	
14	5.	If Plaintiff files opposition papers, Defendants shall file any reply papers on or	
15	before December 15, 2017;		
16	6.	This Stipulation is entered into without prejudice to any party seeking any interim	
17	relief;		
18	7.	Nothing in this Stipulation shall be construed as a waiver of any of Defendants'	
19	rights or positions in law or equity, or as a waiver of any defenses that Defendants would otherwise		
20	have, including, without limitation, jurisdictional defenses; and		
21	8.	The Parties do not seek to stipulate to the foregoing schedule for the purpose of	
22	delay, and the proposed dates will not have an effect on any pre-trial and trial dates as the Cour		
23	has yet to schedule these dates.		
24			
25			
26			
27	///		
, l	///		

1	WHEREFORE, the Parties respectfully request that this Court issue an order granting the		
2	Parties' request to set a pleading and briefing schedule and related deadlines as set forth herein.		
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.		
4	Respectfully submitted,		
5	Dated: June 1, 2017 LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP		
6			
7	By: <u>/s/ Rosemary M. Rivas</u> Rosemary M. Rivas		
8	44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650		
0	San Francisco, CA 94104		
9	Tel: (415) 291-2420		
10	Fax: (415) 484-1294		
10 11	Shannon L. Hopkins (to be admitted pro hac vice) Stephanie A. Bartone (to be admitted pro hac vice)		
12	LEVI & KORSINSKY LLP 733 Summer Street, Suite 304		
12	Stamford, CT 06901		
13	Tel: (203) 992-4523		
1.4	Fax: (212) 363-7171		
14	Email: shopkins@zlk.com Email: sbartone@zlk.com		
15			
16	Counsel for Lead Plaintiff Urešomir Čorak		
17	Michael T. Jones (SBN 290660) mjones@goodwinlaw.com		
10	Lloyd Winawer (SBN 157823)		
18	lwinawer@goodwinlaw.com		
19	Nicholas A. Reider (SBN 296440) nreider@goodwinlaw.com		
20	GOODWIN PROCTER LLP		
21	135 Commonwealth Drive Menlo Park, CA 94025-1105 Tel.: (650) 752-3100		
22	Fax: (650) 853-1038		
23	Counsel for Defendants		
24	FILER'S ATTESTATION		
25	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1 regarding signatures, I attest under penalty of perjury that		
26	the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories.		
27			
28	/s/ Rosemary M. Rivas Rosemary M. Rivas		
	1		

Case No. 3:17-cv-00715-RS

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING PLEADING AND BRIEFING SCHEDULE

1	* * *			
2	ORDER			
3	ORDER			
4	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED			
5				
6	~ 1101			
7	Dated: 6/5 , 2017			
8	HON. RICHARD SEEBORG U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE			
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	(I			