

1 MARK R. THIERMAN, (State Bar No. 72913)
 2 LEON GREENBERG, (State Bar No. 226253)
 3 THIERMAN LAW FIRM
 4 7287 Lakeside Drive, Suite 101
 5 Reno, NV 89511
 6 Telephone: (775) 284-1500
 7 Facsimile: (775) 703-5027

E-Filed 3/10/2011

8 H. TIM HOFFMAN, (State Bar No. 49141)
 9 ARTHUR W. LAZEAR, (State Bar No. 83603)
 10 ROSS L. LIBENSON, (State Bar No. 181912)
 11 HOFFMAN & LAZEAR
 12 180 Grand Avenue, Suite 1550
 13 Oakland, CA 94612
 14 Telephone: (510) 763-5700
 15 Facsimile: (510) 835-1311

16 MAX FOLKENFLIK
 17 FOLKENFLIK & MCGERITY
 18 1500 Broadway, 21st Floor
 19 New York, NY 10036
 20 Telephone: (212)757-0400
 21 Facsimile: (212)757-2010

22 INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS

23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 24 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 25 SAN JOSE DIVISION

26 DAVID HO, on behalf of himself and others
 27 similarly situated and on behalf of the
 28 general public and DOES 1-20

Case No. CV 05-04867 JF (HRL)

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG, LLP

Defendant.

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER EXTENDING THE PAGE LIMIT
 FOR PLAINTIFFS' REPLY
 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
 MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Caption continued on next page.

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

C 08-2853 JF (HRL)

JOSEPH LANDON individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG LLP, a limited liability partnership; ERNST & YOUNG U.S. LLP, a limited liability partnership; and DOES 1-100, inclusive,

Defendant.

MICHELLE RICHARDS, on behalf 16 of herself and all others similarly situated and on behalf of the general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNST & YOUNG LLP, and DOES - 50

Defendant.

C 08-4988 JF (HRL)

1 Plaintiffs Sarah Fernandez and Michelle Richards, and Defendant Ernst & Young LLP, by and
2 through their respective counsel, hereby agree and stipulate as follows:

3 **WHEREAS**, the parties' previously agreed, and the Court entered an Order, permitting the
4 parties to exceed the page limit for the Plaintiffs' Memorandum In Support of Class Certification and
5 Defendant's Memorandum In Opposition to Class Certification;

6 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs have requested a page extension of five (5) pages for its Reply
7 Memorandum, the parties have met and conferred and agreed that Plaintiffs may have twenty (20)
8 pages for their Reply Memorandum to Defendant's Opposition To Class Certification, the page limit
9 for Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum should be amended as follows:

- 10 1. Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in support of their motion for class certification may be
11 twenty (20) pages in length.

12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Dated: March 8, 2011

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

14 By _____ /s/
15 Gregory W. Knopp
16 Attorneys for Defendant,
ERNST & YOUNG LLP

17 Dated: March 8, 2011

HOFFMAN & LAZEAR

18 By _____ /s/
19 Ross L. Libenson
20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs David Ho, Sarah Fernandez and
Michelle Richards

21 ///

22 ///

23 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: March 10, 2010

25 By _____
26 The Honorable J. Kent Fogel
JUDGE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT