UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUE HANIGAN, SAM VANCE, Plaintiff(s),

CASE NO. CV 13 4827

v.

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

ACCREDO HEALTH GROUP, INC., Defendant(s).

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

Court Processes:

- □ Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)
- Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)
- □ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

Private ADR (*please identify process and provider*) Mark S. Rudy, Mediation

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

	the presumptive deadline (<i>The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.</i>)	
X	other requested deadline:	May 30, 2014
Dated:	12/19/13	/s/ Megan E. Ross Attorney for Plaintiff
Dated:	12/19/13	/s/ L. Julius M. Turman Attorney for Defendant

CONTINUE TO FOLLOWING PAGE

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Dockets.Justia.com

- The parties' stipulation is adopted and IT IS SO ORDERED.
- □ The parties' stipulation is modified as follows, and IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 12/23/2013

Saundra Brown Armstrong UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

When filing this document in ECF, please be sure to use the appropriate Docket Event, e.g., "Stipulation and Proposed Order Selecting Mediation."

Rev. 12/11