

1 John V. Picone, Esq. (State Bar No. 187226)  
 jpicone@hopkinscarley.com  
 2 Jennifer S. Coleman, Esq. (State Bar No. 213210)  
 jcoleman@hopkinscarley.com  
 3 C. Gideon Korrell (State Bar No. 284890)  
 gkorrell@hopkinscarley.com  
 4

5 HOPKINS & CARLEY  
 A Law Corporation  
 The Letitia Building  
 6 70 South First Street  
 San Jose, California 95113-2406

7 **mailing address:**  
 P.O. Box 1469  
 8 San Jose, CA 95109-1469  
 Telephone: (408) 286-9800  
 9 Facsimile: (408) 998-4790

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 ENVISTA, LLC and ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC  
 11

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 14 OAKLAND DIVISION

15 ENVISTA, LLC, an Indiana limited liability  
 company; and ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC,  
 16 an Indiana limited liability company,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 AUDINTEL, INC., a California corporation;  
 RAGHVENDRA SINHA, an individual; and  
 20 DOES 1-20,

21 Defendants.  
 22

CASE NO. 4:16-cv-06765-HSG

**STIPULATION TO CONTINUE  
 HEARING ON RAGHVENDRA SINHA'S  
 MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT  
 FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION AND/OR  
 IMPROPER VENUE**

Hon. Haywood S Gilliam, Jr.  
 Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler

Date: August 17, 2017  
 Time: 3:00 p.m.  
 Location: Courtroom 2

Trial Date: None

24 WHEREAS, on May 11, 2017, Defendant Raghvendra Sinha filed a Motion to Dismiss  
 25 for lack of personal jurisdiction and/or improper venue that is currently set to be heard by this  
 26 Court on August 17, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. (Dkt. No. 44);

27 WHEREAS, on May 25, 2017, Plaintiffs' Envista, LLC and Envista Concepts, LLC filed  
 28 their Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 45);

1 WHEREAS, on June 1, 2017, Defendant Raghvendra Sinha filed their Reply to the  
2 Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 46); and

3 WHEREAS, the parties wish to have the hearing on the Motion to Dismiss continued to a  
4 later date, as the parties are in the process of attempting to negotiate a settlement to resolve this  
5 matter;

6 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate, and pursuant to Local Rule 7-7(b)(1),  
7 ask the Court to order that the hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss shall be continued to  
8 September 28, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.

9 IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.

10  
11 Dated: August 15, 2017.

HOPKINS & CARLEY, A Law Corporation

12  
13 By: /s/ John V. Picone III

14 John v. Picone III  
15 Jennifer Coleman  
16 C. Gideon Korrell  
17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs enVista, LLC and  
18 enVista Concepts, LLC

19  
20 Dated: August 15, 2017.

PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS

21  
22 By: /s/ Chad S. Pehrson

23 Jonathan O. Hafen  
24 Jenifer L. Tomchak  
25 Chad S. Pehrson

26  
27 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

28 C. Brandon Wisoff  
Deepak Gupta

Attorneys for Defendants Audintel, Inc. and  
Raghvendra Sinha

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

**ATTESTATION OF E-FILED SIGNATURE**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby certify that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from all signatories for whom a signature is indicated by a “conformed” signature (/ s /) within this electronically filed document and I have on file records to support this concurrence for subsequent production to the Court if so ordered or for inspection upon request.


Dated: August 15, 2017.

By: /s/ John V. Picone III  
John V. Picone III  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
ENVISTA, LLC, and  
ENVISTA CONCEPTS, LLC

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

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: AUGUST 15, 2017

BY:   
HON. HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE