

Ian N. Feinberg (SBN 88324)
ifeinberg@mayerbrownrowe.com
 Dennis S. Corgill (SBN 103429)
dcorgill@mayerbrownrowe.com
 Eric B. Evans (SBN 232476)
eevans@mayerbrownrowe.com
 MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
 Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 300
 3000 El Camino Real
 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112
 Telephone: (650) 331-2000
 Facsimile: (650) 331-2060

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 FREECYCLESUNNYVALE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

FREECYCLESUNNYVALE,
 a California unincorporated association,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE FREECYCLE NETWORK,
 an Arizona corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C06-00324 CW

**STIPULATED REQUEST FOR ORDER
 CHANGING TIME UNDER CIVIL L.R. 6-2**

Before: Honorable Claudia Wilken

THE FREECYCLE NETWORK, INC., an
 Arizona Corporation,

Counterclaimant,

v.

FREECYCLESUNNYVALE, a California
 unincorporated association,

Counterdefendant.

1 PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 6-2, Plaintiff FreecycleSunnyvale and Defendant The
2 Freecycle Network, Inc., respectfully request this Court to enter an order changing time.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION**

4 The above-captioned lawsuit concerns The Freecycle Network's claim of trademark rights
5 over the term "freecycle," the phrase "The Freecycle Network," and a stylized logo depicting the
6 term "freecycle." FreecycleSunnyvale seeks a declaration of non-infringement or, in the
7 alternative, that the alleged trademarks are generic or that The Freecycle Network has engaged in
8 naked licensing. The Freecycle Network filed counterclaims, alleging trademark infringement,
9 contributory infringement, and unfair competition under the Lanham Act, as well as California
10 state-law claims for unfair competition. Counsel for both parties appear *pro bono*. This Court's
11 Case Management Order presently sets the fact discovery cutoff for May 2, 2006. *See* Order
12 (December 22, 2006; Document # 62). For the following reasons, FreecycleSunnyvale and The
13 Freecycle Network respectfully request a ninety (90) day extension of the fact discovery cutoff
14 and all other deadlines in the Case Management Order.

15 **II. REASONS FOR THE REQUESTED ENLARGEMENT OF TIME**

16 First, the parties believe that additional time to conduct discovery is necessary in this case.
17 In an effort to amicably resolve discovery disputes, the parties have met and conferred on several
18 occasions, most recently on December 18, 2006. Many matters have been resolved amicably, and
19 the parties will supplement their discovery. In addition, third party discovery is ongoing. Much
20 of the additional discovery that will be forthcoming is preliminary to selecting deponents and
21 scheduling depositions.

22 Second, the parties continue to focus their efforts in an attempt to resolve their differences
23 through mediation. Previously, in this Court, the parties participated in court-connected
24 mediation on June 13, 2006, but were unable to settle the lawsuit or narrow the issues. A related
25 case, which is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit, was selected for inclusion in the Ninth Circuit's
26 mediation program. That mediation started in January 2007, with the latest conference on March
27 28, 2007. The parties are attempting to reach a global settlement that will include the action
28 before this Court.

Third, assuming that fact discovery will be extended, the other deadlines in this Court's Case Management Order should be similarly extended by ninety (90) days.

III. DISCLOSURE OF PREVIOUS TIME MODIFICATIONS

The parties have previously sought orders modifying time in this case. On June 2, 2006, this Court entered an order extending time to complete court-connected mediation in the Northern District of California. *See* Order (June 2, 2006; Document # 35). On three subsequent occasions, this Court entered orders extending the fact discovery cutoff and related deadlines. *See* Order (August 1, 2006; Document #44); Order (October 3, 2006; Document #57); Order (December 22, 2006; Document # 62).

IV. EFFECT OF THE TIME MODIFICATION ON THE SCHEDULE OF THE CASE

The parties attach a proposed order that revises this Court's Case Management Order by extending the fact discovery cutoff and all other deadlines by approximately ninety (90) days. The following table summarizes the proposed changes to the Case Management Order and to the schedule of the case.

Deadlines	Current Cutoff	Proposed Cutoff
Completion of Fact Discovery:	05/02/07	08/03/07
Disclosure of identities and reports of expert witnesses:	06/01/07	09/04/07
Completion of Expert Discovery:	06/29/07	10/01/07
Plaintiff to file dispositive motion(s) and notice for hearing on 11/29/07 at 2:00 p.m.:	06/29/07	10/11/07
Defendant's opposition and any cross motion (contained in one brief):	07/13/07	10/25/07
Plaintiff's reply/opposition:	07/20/07	11/01/07
Surreply:	07/27/07	11/08/07

Deadlines	Current Cutoff	Proposed Cutoff
Further Case Management Conference at 2:00 p.m. and all case-dispositive motions to be heard on or before:	08/10/07	12/04/07
Final Pretrial Conference at 1:30 p.m. on:	[to be set]	[to be set]
A Trial will begin at 8:30 a.m. on:	[to be set]	[to be set]

The parties' proposed order will not affect the ADR process in this Court. On June 13, 2006, the parties engaged in court-connected mediation, which was conducted by William N. Herbert, Esquire. That mediation was unsuccessful in settling the lawsuit or narrowing the issues to be litigated. The parties' proposed order will facilitate the ADR process in a related case before the Ninth Circuit, which may settle the lawsuit or narrow the issues to be litigated.

