

1 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP
 MICHAEL H. PAGE - #154913
 2 MARK A. LEMLEY - #155830
 KLAUS H. HAMM - #224905
 3 AJAY S. KRISHNAN - #222476
 710 Sansome Street
 4 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
 5 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
 7 GOOGLE INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation,
 12
 Plaintiff,
 13
 v.
 14 AMERICAN BLIND & WALLPAPER
 15 FACTORY, INC., a Delaware corporation
 d/b/a decoratetoday.com, Inc., and DOES 1-
 16 100, inclusive,
 17 Defendants.

Case No. C 03-5340-JF (RS)

**GOOGLE INC.'S AND AMERICAN
 BLIND & WALLPAPER FACTORY'S
 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER GRANTING PARTIES
 ADDITIONAL PAGES FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT BRIEFING**

Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel

18 AMERICAN BLIND & WALLPAPER
 19 FACTORY, INC., a Delaware corporation
 d/b/a decoratetoday.com, Inc.,
 20
 Counter-Plaintiff,
 21
 v.
 22 GOOGLE INC.,
 23
 Counter-Defendant.
 24

1 WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) represents to
2 Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff American Blind & Wallpaper Factory (“ABWF”) and to this
3 Court that Google requires up to ten additional pages, beyond the normal 25-page limit, to
4 adequately address the issues that it will raise in its forthcoming summary judgment motion,

5 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED that both parties may file briefs in
6 support of or in opposition to Google’s and ABWF’s forthcoming summary judgment motions of
7 up to ten (10) pages in excess of the normally applicable page limits. Thus, for any summary
8 judgment motion filed, a party may file an opening brief of up to 35 pages in length, an
9 opposition brief of up to 35 pages in length, and a reply brief of up to 25 pages in length.

10

11 Dated: December 18, 2006

KEKER & VAN NEST

12

13

By: /s/ Michael H. Page
MICHAEL H. PAGE
Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-
Defendant GOOGLE INC.

14

15

16

17 Dated: December 18, 2006

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

18

19

By: /s/ David A. Rammelt
DAVID A. RAMMELT
Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-
Plaintiff AMERICAN BLIND &
WALLPAPER FACTORY

20

21

22 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: December __, 2006

24

25

By: _____
HON. JEREMY FOGEL
United States District Court Judge

26

27

28