

1 GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP  
 2 LIONEL Z. GLANCY (S.B.#134180)  
 3 MICHAEL GOLDBERG (S.B.#196382)  
 4 1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311  
 5 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 6 Telephone: (310) 201-9150  
 7 Facsimile: (310) 201-9160  
 8 E-mail: [info@glancylaw.com](mailto:info@glancylaw.com)

- and -

9 Frederick W. Gerkens, III (*pro hac vice*)  
 10 Robin B. Howald (S.B. #110280)  
 11 1430 Broadway, Suite 1603  
 12 New York, New York 10018  
 13 Telephone: (212) 382-2221  
 14 Facsimile: (212) 382-3944  
 15 E-mail: [fgerkens@glancylaw.com](mailto:fgerkens@glancylaw.com)

*Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiff*

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT CALIFORNIA

18	_____ )	
19	IN RE RACKABLE SYSTEMS, INC. )	Case No. C-09-0222-CW
20	SECURITIES LITIGATION )	
21	_____ )	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
22	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: )	
23	ALL ACTIONS )	
24	_____ )	

25 **STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER REGARDING THE FILING AND**  
 26 **BRIEFING OF PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

27 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ON THE FILING AND  
 28 BRIEFING OF PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Case No. C-09-0222-Cw

1           WHEREAS, on June 15, 2009, Lead Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint for  
2 Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (“Amended Complaint”);

3           WHEREAS on August 13, 2009, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the Amended  
4 Complaint, which motion was briefed by the parties;

5           WHEREAS, on November 19, 2009, a hearing was held on Defendants’ motion to  
6 dismiss the Amended Complaint;

7           WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the hearing, the Court indicated:

8           (a)     The Court was taking the matter under submission to “take another look at it,”  
9 but was “likely to dismiss with leave to amend” some or all of the allegations supporting Lead  
10 Plaintiffs’ securities fraud claims (*see* Docket Entry No. 43, Hearing Transcript, at 13:21-23);

11           (b)     The Court had not ruled upon the motion from the bench, but would instead issue  
12 an order ruling upon the pending motion to dismiss (*see* Hearing Transcript at 14:23-15:1; *see*  
13 *also* Docket Entry No. 42, Minute Order, indicating matter “Under Submission” with an Order  
14 to be prepared by the Court); and

15           (c)     That, with respect to those portions of the Amended Complaint dismissed with  
16 leave to amend, the Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) should be filed during the “second  
17 week of January,” 2010, and, following a six-week briefing schedule, the Case Management  
18 Conference will be conducted on May 11, 2010, “assuming the pleadings are settled by then”  
19 (*see* Hearing Transcript at 14:2-15:7; *see also* Docket Entry No. 42, Minute Order, Notes  
20 setting forth filing and briefing schedule; new Case Management Conference date);

21           WHEREAS the parties respectfully submit that the most efficient manner in which to  
22 proceed would be for the parties to have the benefit of the Court’s Order on the pending motion  
23 concerning the merits of the Amended Complaint before the SAC and briefing thereon is filed;

24           WHEREAS the parties respectfully request one additional week be added to the time to  
25 file an opposition brief and a reply brief, to account for potential scheduling conflicts; and

26           NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned parties hereby stipulate and agree, and  
27 respectfully request that the Court enter an order, as follows:

28  
STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ON THE FILING AND  
BRIEFING OF PLAINTIFFS’ SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Case No. C-09-0222-Cw

1           1.       Lead Plaintiffs shall file their Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) no  
2 later than 21 days after entry of the Court’s Order on the pending motion to dismiss;

3           2.       Defendants shall have 21 days after the filing of the SAC in which to file  
4 a response;

5           3.       Plaintiffs shall have 21 days after the filing of Defendants’ response in  
6 which to file any opposition;

7           4.       Defendants shall have 14 days after the filing of Plaintiffs’ opposition in  
8 which to file a reply.

9           IT IS SO STIPULATED.

10  
11 Dated: December 21, 2009

GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP

12 By: /s/ Fredeick W. Gerkens, III  
13 Frederick W. Gerkens, III (*pro hac vice*)  
14 Robin B. Howald (S.B. #110280)  
15 1430 Broadway, Suite 1603  
16 New York, New York 10018  
17 Tel: (212) 382-2221  
18 Fax: (212) 382-3944  
19 E-mail: [fgerkens@nyc.rr.com](mailto:fgerkens@nyc.rr.com)

20 - and -

21 Lionel Z. Glancy (S.B.#134180)  
22 Michael Goldberg (SB#188669)  
23 1801 Ave. of the Stars, Suite 311  
24 Los Angeles, CA, 90067  
25 Tel: (310) 201-9150  
26 Fax: (310) 201-9160  
27 E-mail: [info@glancylaw.com](mailto:info@glancylaw.com)

28 *Lead Counsel for Plaintiff and the Class*

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

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

Dated: December 21, 2009

By: s/ Meredith N. Landy  
Meredith N. Landy

*Attorneys for Defendants Rackable Systems,  
Inc., Thomas K. Barton and Madhu  
Ranganathan*

I, Frederick W. Gerken, III am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding the Filing and Briefing of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint. In compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that Meredith N. Landy has concurred in this filing.

By: Frederick W. Gerken, III

Frederick W. Gerken, III (*pro hac vice*)

**ORDER**

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 12/28, 2009



\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Claudia Wilken  
United States District Judge