| 1  | James P. Keenley (State Bar No. 253106)   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 2  | Emily A. Bolt (State Bar No. 253109)<br>BOLT · KEENLEY - ATTORNEYS AT LAW   |  |
| 3  | 1010 Grayson Street, Suite Two<br>Oakland, California 94710   |  |
| 4  | Phone: (510) 225-0696   |  |
| 5  | Fax: (510) 225-1095   |  |
| 6  | Attorneys for Plaintiff   |  |
| 7  | Linda M. Lawson (Bar No. 77130)   |  |
| 8  | llawson@mmhllp.com<br>Allison Vana (Bar No. 228282)   |  |
| 9  | avana@mmhllp.com<br>MESERVE, MUMPER & HUGHES LLP  |  |
| 10   | 300 South Grand Avenue, 24th Floor<br>Los Angeles, California 90071-3185  |  |
| 11   | Telephone: (213) 620-0300<br>Facsimile: (213) 625-1930  |  |
| 12   | Attorneys for Defendant   |  |
| 13   | THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE COMPANIES OF AMERICA   | NY   |
| 14   |   |  |
|  |   |  |
| 15   |   | S DISTRICT COURT   |
| 16   | FOR THE NORTHERN  | S DISTRICT COURT<br>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br>CISCO DIVISION   |
| 16<br>17   | FOR THE NORTHERN  | DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |
| 16<br>17<br>18   | FOR THE NORTHERN  | DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19   | FOR THE NORTHERN<br>SAN FRANC   | DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br>CISCO DIVISION<br>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)<br>)<br>) STIPULATION REGARDING   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20   | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC   | DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br>CISCO DIVISION<br>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)<br>)  |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21   | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.   | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> </ul>                                     |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>   | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey                 | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>   | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey<br>corporation, | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>                                     | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey                 | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>                         | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey<br>corporation, | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>                                     | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey<br>corporation, | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> </ol>             | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey<br>corporation, | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |
| <ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> </ol> | FOR THE NORTHERN I<br>SAN FRANC<br>Linda DOLAN,<br>Plaintiff,<br>v.<br>THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA, a New Jersey<br>corporation, | <ul> <li>DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA<br/>CISCO DIVISION</li> <li>) Case No.: CV 11-1562 (PJH)</li> <li>)</li> <li>) STIPULATION REGARDING</li> <li>) DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF</li> <li>) REVIEW; [PROPOSED] ORDER</li> </ul> |

| 1  |   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2  | WHEREAS, on September 1, 2011, the parties participated in a case management                        |  |  |
| 3  | conference during which the Court ordered the parties to resolve issues pertaining to the           |  |  |
| 4  | applicable standard of review in 60 days; and   |  |  |
| 5  | WHEREAS, the parties have met and conferred regarding the standard of review and                    |  |  |
| 6  | related issues and have reached an agreement as to the applicable standard of review and scope      |  |  |
| 7  | of discovery;   |  |  |
| 8  | IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED AS FOLLOWS:  |  |  |
| 9  | The parties agree that the Court should apply a <i>de novo</i> standard of review to Plaintiff's    |  |  |
| 10 | claim and, if this stipulation is approved by the Court, that no discovery will be conducted. The   |  |  |
| 11 | parties reserve the right to bring evidentiary motions related to the content of the administrative |  |  |
| 12 | record within the motions deadline already established by the Court.                                |  |  |
| 13 |   |  |  |
| 14 | Dated: November 1, 2011BOLT · KEENLEY - ATTORNEYS AT LAW  |  |  |
| 15 |   |  |  |
| 16 | By: <u>/s/ James P. Keenley</u><br>James P. Keenley   |  |  |
| 17 | Attorneys for Plaintiff   |  |  |
| 18 | Dated: November 1, 2011 MESERVE, MUMPER & HUGHES LLP  |  |  |
| 19 | Dated. November 1, 2011 WESERVE, MUNIPER & HUGHES LLP   |  |  |
| 20 | By: /s/ Allison Vana  |  |  |
| 21 | Linda M. Lawson   |  |  |
| 22 | Allison Vana<br>Attorneys for Defendant   |  |  |
| 23 | THE PRUDENTIAL INSURANCE<br>COMPANY OF AMERICA  |  |  |
| 24 |   |  |  |
| 25 |   |  |  |
| 26 |   |  |  |
| 27 |   |  |  |
| 28 | CASE NO. CV 11-1562 (PJH) 2 STIPULATION REGARDING DISCOVERY<br>AND THE STANDARD OF REVIEW           |  |  |

## [PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING STIPULATION

The Court, having considered the submissions of the parties and good cause showing, approves the parties' stipulation as to the appropriate standard of review and scope of discovery. The Court will apply a *de novo* standard of review to Plaintiff's claim and there will be no discovery by either party.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 11/3/11



STIPULATION REGARDING DISCOVERY AND THE STANDARD OF REVIEW