	Case 5:05-cv-00037-JW	Document 66	Filed 04/25/2006	Page 1 of 3	
1	Michael D. Braun (#167416) BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C			ittelstaedt #060359 Mitchell #143124	
2	12400 Wilshire Boulevard,	•	Tracy M. Str	Tracy M. Strong #221540 JONES DAY	
3	Suite 920 Los Angeles, CA 90025		555 Californ	ia Street, 26 th Floor	
4	Telephone: (310) 442-7755 Facsimile: (310) 442-7756		Telephone:	o, CA 94104 (415) 626-3939	
5				(415) 875-5700 t@jonesday.com	
6	Roy A. Katriel (<i>pro hac vice</i>) THE KATRIEL LAW FIRM 1101 30 TH Street, NW)	cnmitchell@jonesday.com tstrong@jonesday.com		
7	Suite 500 Washington, DC 20007		Counsel for I	Defendant	
8	Telephone: (202) 625-4342		eeunserje. I	z eg entilenti	
9	Jacqueline Sailer Eric J. Belfi (<i>pro hac vice</i>)				
10	MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP 275 Madison Avenue Suite 801 New York, NY 10016-1101				
11					
12	Telephone: (212) 682-1818 Facsimile: (212) 682-1892				
13	Counsel for Plaintiff	Counsel for Plaintiff			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
16	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
17					
18	THOMAS WILLIAM SLATTERY, Individually, And On Behalf Of All Others Similarly Situated,		Case No. C 05 0003'	7 JW	
19		OI All	CLASS ACTION		
20	Plaintiff,		JOINT FURTHER STATEMENT	CASE MANAGEMENT	
21	V.		Date: May 8, 2006	May 8, 2006	
22	APPLE COMPUTER, INC	••	Time: 9:00 a.m.		
23	Defendan	t.	riace. Courtiooni o,		
24					
25					
26	The parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this Further Case Management				
27	Statement.				
28	Statement.				
			JOINT F	C 05 00037 JW URTHER CMC STATEMENT	

10

12

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

The schedule for the case will depend on the Court's decision on the pending motion for leave to file the proposed second amended complaint. In the event that the Court grants the motion, the parties propose the following class discovery schedule.

- Defendant to serve written discovery to plaintiffs by May 15, 2006.
- Plaintiffs to respond to written discovery by June 15, 2006.
- Defendant to respond to previous written discovery served by Slattery by June 15, 2006.
- Plaintiffs to submit to depositions by August 15, 2006.

Defendant proposes that, after that discovery, the parties may move for summary judgment or adjudication on the following schedule.

- Rule 56 motions: September 15, 2006.
- Oppositions: October 13, 2006.
- Reply: November 3, 2006.
- Hearing: November 20, 2006.

Given that the Court has previously limited the initial round of discovery to that germane for plaintiff's class certification motion, plaintiff objects to defendant being allowed to file a motion for summary judgment prior to adjudication on the motion for class certification, and specifically objects to holding a hearing on summary judgment prior to the opportunity to obtain all pertinent discovery. Plaintiff also reserves the right to object to Rule 56 motions before class determination and reserves the right to request discovery necessary to meet any such motion.

In defendant's view, plaintiffs will be able to obtain appropriate discovery in that the parties have agreed that plaintiffs can depose any summary judgment declarant not previously deposed. In addition, plaintiffs may use Rule 56(f) if they believe they need additional discovery to meet the summary judgment motions.

Defendant proposes that if a party moves for summary judgment or adjudication, the schedule for determination of class certification will be set, if necessary, after the Rule 56 motion is decided. Plaintiff submits that class certification adjudication should proceed before any

Document 66

Filed 04/25/2006

Page 3 of 3

Case 5:05-cv-00037-JW