

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

\*\*E-Filed 8/11/06\*\*

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

KINDERSTART.COM LLC, a California limited liability company, on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case Number C 06-2057 JF (RS)

ADMINISTRATIVE AND  
CLARIFICATION ORDER

[re: docket no. 43]

Plaintiff Kinderstart.com LLC (“Kinderstart”) requests an extension of certain dates in the instant action and a clarification of this Court’s Order dated July 13, 2006. On June 30, 2006, this Court set a tentative date of September 29, 2006 for argument on the anticipated motion of Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”) to dismiss Kinderstart’s anticipated Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”). The Court also set a case management conference for that date. Kinderstart requests that the motion hearing date and the case management conference be continued until on or after December 1, 2006. Defendant Google opposes this request and asks that the hearing be continued only until October 6, 2006 and that the case management conference be scheduled during the hearing.

1 Having considered both parties' requests, the Court hereby sets the following schedule:

- 2 September 1, 2006 Deadline for filing SAC
- 3 September 22, 2006 Deadline for filing motion(s) responsive to the SAC
- 4 October 13, 2006 Deadline for filing opposition
- 5 October 20, 2006 Deadline for filing reply
- 6 October 27, 2006 Oral argument on motion(s) and case management conference

7  
8 Having granted in part Kinderstart's request for an extension of time for filing its SAC, thus  
9 allowing Kinderstart additional time to frame its claims, the Court advises Kinderstart that it may  
10 be less inclined to grant further leave to amend its pleadings should Google's motion to dismiss  
11 be meritorious.

12 Additionally, Kinderstart requests clarification as to whether the July 13, 2006 Order  
13 dismissed its first claim with or without leave to amend. The Court hereby clarifies that the  
14 Order dismissed all of Kinderstart's claims with leave to amend.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: August 11, 2006

17  
18  
19   
20 JEREMY FOGEL  
United States District Judge

