

1 MICHEL F. MILLS, SBN 193002  
 2 THE LAW OFFICES OF MICHEL F. MILLS  
 3 A Professional Corporation  
 4 14121 Beach Boulevard  
 5 Westminster, California 92683  
 6 Tel. 714.892.2936 / Fax. 714.892.5806  
 7 Email: [Lagunalaw@hotmail.com](mailto:Lagunalaw@hotmail.com)

8 JOHN R. COGORNO, SBN 63966  
 9 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 10 14121 Beach Boulevard  
 11 Westminster, California 92683  
 12 Tel. 714.892.2936 / Fax. 714.892.5806  
 13 Email: [cogorno@msn.com](mailto:cogorno@msn.com)

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 MARK ANTHONY JAEDEL,  
 18 Plaintiff,  
 19 vs.  
 20 THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,  
 21 Defendants,

Case No: C09-00242 CW

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO  
 CONTINUE CASE MANAGEMENT  
 CONFERENCE AND RELATED  
 DEADLINES

CMC Hrg. Date: June 9, 2011  
 Time: 2:00 p.m.  
 Courtroom: 2

22 By Order dated October 12, 2010, this Court set the above referenced action for  
 23 Case Management Conference on June 9, 2011, at 2:00 p.m, in addition to many related  
 24 deadlines, pre-trial conference and trial.

25 The parties have been working diligently to complete discovery. All parties have  
 26 exchanged written discovery. Plaintiffs have received bankers boxes of documents initially  
 27 provided on CDs. These documents have been reviewed and continue to be reviewed  
 28 which are driving the need for further litigation. Depositions of Plaintiffs have been taken.

1 Plaintiffs have taken the depositions of certain defendants and witnesses, some of which  
2 have been completed and others to be scheduled.

3 One of the reasons the parties jointly seek continuance of the pretrial schedule is  
4 their need for Court assistance in resolving a difference of understanding that developed  
5 between them. Through the discovery process and through the parties' effort to give class  
6 notice, important differences arose between the parties regarding the definitions of the  
7 classes this Court certified. In short, the dispute arises from Defendants' counsels' belief  
8 "that the description of the class as set forth in the Court's original certification order does  
9 not conform to the certification order itself." Defendants hold the opinion that the class  
10 definition requires modification. Plaintiffs hold the position that the present definition is  
11 accurate, and, if any modification is necessary, any such modification would only expand  
12 the size of the class to comport with established Ninth Circuit law.

13 The parties have worked hard and in good faith to resolve these differences  
14 informally and without court intervention. This disagreement has, however, prevented the  
15 parties from reaching agreement the content of the class notice. This, in turn, has  
16 prevented the parties from disseminating class notice. The parties agree that, despite their  
17 best efforts to resolve these differences without need to burden this Court, the time has  
18 come to seek the within continuance and to present the issues for determination by this  
19 Court.

20 The undersigned hereby stipulate and respectfully request that the Court continue  
21 the Case Management Conference and all pending deadlines as follows:

22 Date of next case management conference:	1/19/2012
23 Completion of Fact Discovery:	10/27/2011
24 Disclosure of identities and reports of expert witnesses:	11/16/2011
25 Completion of Expert Discovery:	12/16/2011
26 All case-dispositive motions to be heard at 2:00 p.m. on or before:	1/26/2012
27 Plaintiffs' counsel intends to file a Motion for Summary Judgment.	
28 Plaintiffs' opening brief due:	11/17/2011

1 Defendants' opposition/cross motion (contained within a single brief) due: 12/15/2011  
2 Plaintiffs' reply/opposition to cross motion (contained within a single brief) due: 12/29/2011  
3 Defendants' reply due: 1/12/2012  
4 Final Pre-Trial Conference at 2:00 p.m. on: 4/03/2012  
5 A 10 day Jury Trial will begin at 8:30 a.m. on: 4/16/2012

6 Accordingly, the parties respectfully request and jointly stipulate to the above listed  
7 continuances.

8 It is so stipulated.

9  
10 DATED: 6/2/2011

/S/ Gregory J. Rockwell  
GREGORY J. ROCKWELL, ESQ.,  
Attorney for Defendants, COUNTY OF  
ALAMEDA and PAUL LISKEY

11  
12  
13 DATED: 6/2/2011

/S/ John R. Cogorno  
JOHN R. COGORNO, ESQ.,  
Attorney for Plaintiff

14  
15  
16 DATED: 6/2/2011

/S/ Michel F. Mills  
MICHEL F. MILLS, ESQ.,  
Attorney for Plaintiff

17  
18  
19 **ORDER**

20 Satisfactory proof having been made, and good cause appearing,

21 IT IS ORDERED that the above listed continuances are granted, except that case  
22 management conference will be held on Jan. 26 at 2 pm.

23  
24 DATED: 6/3/2011

  
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
US District Court Judge