

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SC INNOVATIONS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-07440-JCS](#)

**ORDER REGARDING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO
COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 15

On January 7, 2019 Defendant Uber Technologies, Inc. (“Uber”) filed an administrative motion for an extension of time to respond to the complaint filed by Plaintiff SC Innovations, Inc. (“Sidecar”), the deadline for which is currently January 10, 2019, to allow Uber time to file a motion to disqualify Sidecar’s counsel based on that law firm’s prior work on behalf of Uber. Uber contends that resolving the motion to disqualify before requiring a response to the complaint might avoid unnecessary work if counsel is disqualified and the present complaint is stricken as a result of that disqualification. Uber requests a briefing schedule beginning in February and extending into March, with the deadline to respond to the complaint stayed until the motion is resolved. Based on the imminent current deadline to respond to the complaint, Uber asks the Court to shorten time for Sidecar to respond to the administrative motion.

Rather than shorten the deadline for Sidecar to respond to the present motion, the Court hereby extends Uber’s deadline to respond to the complaint by one week, to January 17, 2019, as a provisional measure to allow time to consider Uber’s administrative motion. Sidecar shall respond to Uber’s administrative motion in due course no later than January 11, 2019. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-11(b). The Court will address Uber’s administrative motion after Sidecar files its response.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 8, 2019


JOSEPH C. SPERO
Chief Magistrate Judge