San Francisco Te	chnology Inc. v. The Brita Products C	ompany	Doc.
San Francisco Te 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 00//11 12 00//11 13 14 15 10 110 110 110 110 110 110	 Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq. (Cal. F Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq. (Cal. F Benjamin R. Lemke (Cal. Bar No Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P Riverpark Tower, Suite 1650 333 West San Carlos Street San Jose CA 95110-2740 Phone: (408) 279-7000 Fax: (408) 998-1473 Email: kspelman@mount.com; d blemke@mount.com Counsel for San Francisco Techn 	Bar No. 154512) Bar No. 229683) o. 271706) .C. fingerman@mount.com;	
25			
26			
27			
28			
			Dockets.Justia.c

26

Dockets.Justia.com

1	The parties stipulation and request that the court enter an order as follows:			
2	1. The parties have reached a settlement which would result in the dismissal of this case			
3	and avoid the need for motion practice. The parties request a continuance of dates relating to pending			
4	motions to allow time for a formal settlement agreement to be executed.			
5	2. Defendant Brita filed a motion to dismiss (Docket No. 22) on April 14, 2011 which			
6	remains pending. In an order entered upon an earlier stipulation (Docket No. 21), the court set the			
7	following schedule for that motion:			
8	a. Opposition: Wednesda	ay, June 1, 2011		
9	b. Reply: Wednesday, Ju	ine 8, 2011		
10	c. Hearing: Wednesday,	July 6, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.		
11	3. The parties request that the co	ourt continue the opposition and reply date of the above		
12	dates to allow time for the parties to execute a formal written settlement agreement and dismiss this			
13	case. The parties request that the following dates be applied:			
0007-677 (2004) AND	a. Opposition: Wednesday, June 15, 2011			
15 HONE	b. Reply: Wednesday, June 22, 2011			
= 16	c. Hearing (unchanged):	Wednesday, July 6 2011 at 9:00 a.m.		
17	The above-proposed schedule still provides the Court with full briefing two full weeks prior			
18	to the hearing (pursuant to the Local Rules).			
19	In accordance with General Order 45.X.B., Daniel H. Fingerman, counsel for SF Tech, attests			
20	that each other signatory listed below has concurred in this filing.			
21				
22	Date: June 1, 2011	Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P.C., /s/ Daniel H. Fingerman		
23		Counsel for San Francisco Technology Inc.		
24	Date: June 1, 2011	DLA Piper LLP (US)		
25		/s/ Andrew P. Valentine The Brita Products Company		
26	Pursuant to stipulation, it is so ordered.	STATUS DISTRICT CEL		
27	Date: $\frac{6/2}{11}$	TT IS SO ORDERED		
28	Datt	Phyllis J. Hamilton, U.S. District, udge		
	Case No. 4:10-cv-1648-PJH-HRL Page 1 Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Continue Motion Hearing and Briefing to Allow Time For Settlement			
	Suparation and [110posed] Order to Continue Motion rearing and Dreining to Anow Thile For Settlement			

MOUNT, SPELMAN & FINGERMAN, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740 TELEPHONE (408) 279-7000

