

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

JASMEN HOLLOWAY, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
BEST BUY CO., INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

No. C 05-5056 PJH

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO STAY**

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

The court is in receipt of plaintiffs' administrative motion seeking a stay of proceedings in light of the Supreme Court's review of Dukes v. Wal-Mart, and defendants' opposition in response thereto.

The court hereby DENIES plaintiffs' motion in part, and GRANTS it in part. Plaintiffs' request to be relieved of their obligation to file a reply brief is denied, in view of the amount of time plaintiffs have had to prepare their reply brief and the time and resources spent by both parties in re-briefing class certification arguments, and in the interest of preserving the status quo. Plaintiffs' reply brief is therefore due no later than December 15, 2010, pursuant to the stipulation recently entered by the parties. However, to the extent plaintiffs otherwise seek a stay of proceedings in the action – including a stay of the hearing on the motion for class certification – until after the Supreme Court issues a decision in Dukes v. Wal-Mart, the motion for a stay is granted.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 8, 2010



\_\_\_\_\_  
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge