

1 ARTHUR A. HARTINGER (SBN 121521)
 ahartinger@publiclawgroup.com
 2 LINDA M. ROSS (SBN 133874)
 lross@publiclawgroup.com
 3 SPENCER J. WILSON (SBN 266938)
 swilson@publiMclawgroup.com
 4 RYAN MCGINLEY-STEMPEL (SBN 296182)
 rmcinleystempel@publiclawgroup.com
 5 RENNE PUBLIC LAW GROUP®
 350 Sansome Street, Suite 300
 6 San Francisco, California 94104
 Telephone: (415) 848-7200
 7 Facsimile: (415) 848-7230

8 Attorneys for Defendant
 CITY OF SANTA ROSA
 9

10
 11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13

14 TIMOTHY ABOUDARA, JR. et al.

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 CITY OF SANTA ROSA,

18 Defendant.
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Case No. 4:17-cv-01661-HSG

**JOINT SUBMISSION REGARDING
 EXPEDITED BRIEFING SCHEDULE
 (Dkt. No. 90); ORDER**

Action filed: March 27, 2017
 Trial date: September 10, 2018

1 WHEREAS on June 14, 2018, Defendant filed a Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending
2 Administrative Rulemaking (the “Motion to Stay,” Dkt. 87);

3 WHEREAS the hearing on Defendant’s Motion to Stay is set for September 13, 2018, at
4 2:00 p.m.;

5 WHEREAS on June 14, 2018, Defendant filed an Administrative Motion to Expedite the Hearing
6 on the Stay Motion (the “Administrative Motion to Expedite Hearing,” Dkt. 88) so that it may be heard
7 concurrently with Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 67), which is already set to be heard
8 on July 19, 2018, at 2:00 p.m.;

9 WHEREAS on June 15, 2018, the Court directed the Plaintiffs to file either an opposition or a
10 statement of non-opposition to Defendant’s Administrative Motion to Expedite Hearing and directed the
11 parties to meet and confer and to submit a proposed expedited briefing schedule on Defendant’s Motion
12 to Stay (Dkt. 90);

13 WHEREAS on June 18, 2018, Plaintiffs filed a Statement of Non-Opposition to Defendant’s
14 Administrative Motion to Expedite (Dkt. 92);

15 WHEREAS the parties met and conferred in accordance with the Court’s order and have reached
16 a proposed expedited briefing schedule that accommodates defense counsel’s pre-planned vacations;

17 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties through their counsel of record,
18 subject to the approval of the Court, that

- 19 1. Plaintiffs shall file their opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Stay on or before
20 July 3, 2018.
- 21 2. Defendant shall file any reply in support of its Motion to Stay on or before July 12,
22 2018.

23 The parties do not seek to modify any other deadlines in the scheduling order at this time.

24 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

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

Dated: June 18, 2018

RENNE PUBLIC LAW GROUP®

By: /s/ Arthur A. Hartinger
Arthur A. Hartinger

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY OF SANTA ROSA

Dated: June 18, 2018

MASTAGNI HOLSTEDT, A.P.C.

By: /s/ Ian B. Sangster
Ian B. Sangster

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
TIMOTHY ABOUDARA, JR. et al.

1 **ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 5-1**

2 Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of this document
3 has been obtained from each of the other signatories.

4 Dated: June 18, 2018

/s/ Arthur A. Hartinger
Arthur A. Hartinger

1 **ORDER**

2 Pursuant to the foregoing stipulation and good cause appearing, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 3 1. Defendant’s Administrative Motion to Expedite the Hearing on its Motion to Stay
4 Proceedings Pending Administrative Rulemaking (Dkt. 88), is granted.
- 5 2. The hearing on Defendant’s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Administrative
6 Rulemaking (Dkt. 87, the “Motion to Stay”), currently set for September 13, 2018, is
7 hereby rescheduled for July 19, 2018, at 2:00 p.m.
- 8 3. Plaintiffs shall file their opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Stay on or before July 3,
9 2018.
- 10 4. Defendant shall file any reply in support of its Motion to Stay on or before July 12, 2018.

11
12 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 Dated: June 19, 2018


15 Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
16 U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE