1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669	
1	City Attorney JOANNE HOEPER, State Bar #114961	
2	Chief Trial Attorney	
2	ROBERT A. BONŤA, State Bar #202668	
3	Deputy City Attorney	
4	MÉRÉDITH B. OSBORN, State Bar #250467 Deputy City Attorney	
	Fox Plaza	
5	1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor	
6	San Francisco, California 94102-5408	
	Telephone: (415) 554-3911 Facsimile: (415) 554-3837	
7	E-Mail: meredith.osborn@sfgov.org	
8		
0	Attorneys For Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,	
9	CHIEF HEATHER FONG, OFFICER GREGO	RY
	BUHAGIAR, AND OFFICER ARSHAD RAZZ	
10		
11		
	UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
12		
13	NORTHERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
	ERIC JONES,	Case No. C08-00373 CW
14		
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER
	vs.	EXTENDING DEADLINE FOR HEARING ON DISPOSITIVE
16	Y 5.	MOTIONS AS MODIFIED
17	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	
1 /	FRANCISCO, a municipal corporation;	Trial Date: May 18, 2009
18	HEATHER FONG, in her capacity as Chief of Police for the CITY AND COUNTY OF	
	SAN FRANCISCO; GREGORY	
19	BUHAGIAR, individually and in his official	
20	capacity as a police officer for the CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;	
	ARSHAD RAZZAK, individually and in his	
21	official capacity as a police officer for the	
22	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	
<i></i>	FRANCISCO, and San Francisco police officers DOES 1-25, inclusive,	
23	officers DOED 1-23, inclusive,	
,	Defendants.	
24		
25		
		4543.4
26	Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Proced	ure 16(b) the parties have met and conferred and

DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS STIPULATION CASE NO. C08-00373 CW

27

28

agree that the fact discovery in this matter shall conform to the terms of this ORDER.

10

14

22

20

28

26

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, the parties stipulate, through their attorneys of record, to the entry of an order as follows:

- 1. Defendants timely noticed and subpoenaed Christopher Gascon for a deposition on October 17, 2008. Christopher Gascon failed to appear for his deposition.
- 2. Based on plaintiff's counsel's representations that he was in contact with Mr. Gascon, and that Mr. Gascon's failure to attend was due to inadvertence, defendants then noticed Mr. Gascon's deposition for Monday, November 10, 2008.
- 3. Plaintiff's counsel was unable to reach Mr. Gascon ahead of that deposition, and Mr. Gascon did not attend.
- 4. Counsel therefore stipulated to an extension of the deadline to file dispositive motions until December 1, 2008, in determine whether Mr. Gascon could be voluntarily produced for his deposition. Defendants also stated in the stipulation that if Mr. Gascon could not be contacted and his deposition calendared before December 1, 2008, defendants would seek further relief in the form of a petition for an order to show cause why Mr. Gascon should not be held in contempt of court and a further extension of the deadline to file dispositive motions.
- 5. As of today's date, Mr. Gascon could not be contacted and his deposition could therefore not be calendared before December 1, 2008.
- 6. Defendants therefore filed a petition for an order to show cause why Mr. Gascon should not be found in contempt of court on November 25, 2008, along with an administrative motion to hear the petition on shortened time.
- 7. Christopher Gascon is the only percipient third-party witness to the incident alleged in the Complaint who has been specifically identified in this case. (Plaintiff alleges that a Department of Public Works employee was also a percipient witness to the incident alleged in the Complaint, but that individual has not yet been identified.) Christopher Gascon was with plaintiff when the incident alleged in the Complaint occurred.
- 8. Christopher Gascon's testimony is therefore an essential predicate to filing a dispositive motion in this case. Mr. Gascon's testimony will help defendants determine whether to file a summary judgment motion, and what arguments and defenses to assert in that motion. In either DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS STIPULATION 2

event, filing a dispositive motion without the benefit of Mr. Gascon's testimony would not be an		
efficient use of attorney or judicial resources.		
9. Counsel believe that the deadline for filing dispositive motions should be set for ten		
days after Mr. Gascon is deposed.		
For the foregoing reasons, the deadline for filing dispositive motions shall set for ten days		
after the deposition of Mr. Gascon. Counsel will notify the Court of the date that Mr. Gascon's		
deposition is taken, and stipulate to a briefing schedule and hearing date consistent with this		
stipulation.		
IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
Dated: November , 2008		
DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney		
JOANNE HÖEPER Chief Trial Attorney		
ROBERT BONTA Deputy City Attorney		
MÉRÉDITH B. OSBORN Deputy City Attorney		
By: MEREDITH B. OSBORN		
Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CHIEF HEATHER FONG,		
OFFICER BUHAGIAR, and OFFICER RAZZAK		
D. I.N. 1 2000		
Dated: November , 2008		
By: BENJAMIN NISENBAUM		
Attorney for Plaintiff		

28

1	ORDER	
2		
3		spositive motion hearing cutoff is continued to February 5,
4	2009, at 2:00 p.m.	$C_1 \sim A_1 \sim A_2 $
5	12/2/08	Chidealeit
6	Dated:	HON. CLAUDIA WILKEN
7		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

27

28