

1 Robert S. Arns, State Bar No. 65071 (rsa@arnslaw.com)
 Jonathan E. Davis, State Bar No. 191346 (jed@arnslaw.com)
 2 Kevin M. Osborne, State Bar No. 261367 (kmo@arnslaw.com)
 Julie C. Erickson, State Bar No. 293111 (jce@arnslaw.com)
 3 Shounak S. Dharap, State Bar No. 311557 (ssd@arnslaw.com)

4 **THE ARNS LAW FIRM**
 5 A Professional Corporation
 6 515 Folsom Street, 3rd Floor
 San Francisco, California 94105
 7 Phone: (415) 495-7800
 8 Fax: (415) 495-7888

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10
 11 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 12 CIVIL UNLIMITED

13 KIMBERLEE KELLER and TOMMY
 14 GARADIS, Individually and On Behalf of All
 Others Similarly Situated,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 vs.

17 AMAZON.COM, INC.; AMAZON LOGISTICS,
 18 INC.; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

19 Defendants.

No. C17-cv-02219 RS

**STIPULATION REQUESTING
 AMENDED BRIEFING SCHEDULE
 AND HEARING RE MOTION TO
 DISMISS, STAY, OR VACATE AND
 MOTION TO COMPEL
 ARBITRATION AND TO CONTINUE
 INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT
 CONFERENCE PURSUANT TO
 LOCAL RULE 6-2; ~~PROPOSED~~
 ORDER**

Courtroom: 3
 Judge: Hon. Richard G. Seeborg
 Trial Date: None Set

28 STIPULATION REQUESTING AMENDED BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING RE
 MOTION TO DISMISS, STAY, OR VACATE AND MOTION TO COMPEL
 ARBITRATION AND TO CONTINUE INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
 PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6-2; PROPOSED ORDER

1
2
3 This Stipulation is entered into by and among Plaintiffs Kimberlee Keller and
4 Tommy Garadis, who are putative class representatives in *Keller, et al. v. Amazon.Com, et al.*,
5 No. C17-cv-02219 RS, N.D. Cal., and Defendants Amazon Inc. and Amazon Logistics, Inc.
6 (collectively, “Amazon”), by and through their respective counsel.

7 WHEREAS, Defendants filed, in response to Plaintiffs’ Complaint, a Motion to
8 Dismiss, Stay, or Transfer Venue and a Motion to Compel Individual Arbitration
9 (collectively, “the Motions”) on May 11, 2017;

10 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs need additional time to prepare oppositions to the two
11 Motions;

12 WHEREAS, the parties had previously stipulated to an extension of time for
13 Defendants to respond to the Complaint;

14 WHEREAS, on May 15, 2017, Plaintiffs requested that Defendants stipulate to an
15 extension of time for Plaintiffs’ responses to the Motions and proposed that the parties begin
16 preliminary discovery prior to filing Plaintiffs’ responses;

17 WHEREAS, the parties subsequently met and conferred in writing and
18 telephonically, and Defendants opposed Plaintiffs’ proposal to conduct discovery prior to the
19 adjudication of the Motions, but agreed to extend the parties’ time for briefing and to continue
20 the hearing on the Motions, subject to the Court’s permission and availability, so long as
21 Plaintiffs did not use the extended time period prior to the hearing to conduct discovery;

22 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have agreed not to conduct discovery prior to the hearing, but
23 will, in their opposition to the Motion to Compel Arbitration, seek the Court’s permission to
24 conduct discovery prior to a ruling on the Motion;

25 WHEREAS, the parties’ oppositions and replies will likely address complex issues,
26 including but not limited to, Plaintiffs’ claimed exemption from the Federal Arbitration Act,

1 the claimed unenforceability of the class action waiver signed by Plaintiffs, the claimed
2 procedural and substantive unconscionability of the arbitration agreement, and the first-to-file
3 rule; and

4 WHEREAS, the Civil Local Rules permit parties to stipulate to extended time for
5 complex motions;

6 WHEREAS, the Initial Case Management Conference is currently scheduled for July
7 27, 2017 at 10 a.m., the same day as the parties' proposed new hearing date for the Motions
8 and the parties' joint case management conference statement is currently due one week before
9 the proposed new hearing date for the Motions on July 20, 2017;

10 WHEREAS, the parties believe that it will be more productive to conduct an initial
11 case management conference after the Court hears the pending Motions, which may eliminate
12 or narrow issues to be addressed at the initial case management conference;

13 WHEREAS, the Court is not available on July 13, 2017 and counsel for Defendants
14 is not available to attend a hearing on July 20, 2017;

15 NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby agree and stipulate to the following:

- 16 1. Plaintiffs' deadline to oppose the Motion to Dismiss, Stay, or Vacate and the Motion
17 to Compel Individual Arbitration is extended to June 15, 2017;
- 18 2. The deadline for Defendants' corresponding replies in support of said Motions is
19 extended to June 29, 2017;
- 20 3. The hearing on the Motions is continued until July 27, 2017 at 1:30 p.m., or as soon
21 thereafter as is convenient for the Court's schedule; and
- 22 4. The Initial Case Management Conference is continued to September 14, 2017 at 10
23 a.m., or as soon thereafter as is convenient for the Court's schedule.

24
25 **IT IS SO STIPULATED**

1
2
3 **ORDER**

4 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION:

- 5 1. Plaintiffs shall file their oppositions to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Stay, or
6 Vacate and Motion to Compel Individual Arbitration (collectively, "the Motions") on
7 or before June 15, 2017;
- 8 2. Defendants shall file their corresponding replies in support of the Motions on or before
9 June 22, 2017;
- 10 3. The hearing on the Motions is continued until July 27, 2017 at 1:30 ~~a.m./~~
11 p.m.; and
- 12 4. 4. The Initial Case Management Conference is continued to
13 September 14, 2017 at 10:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: May 26, 2017

16 

17 Hon. Richard Seeborg
18 United States District Court Judge