Shloss v. Sweeney e	t al				Doc. 63
	Case 5:06-cv-03718-JW [	Oocument 63	Filed 02/15/2007	Page 1 of 3	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP MARK A. LEMLEY - #15583 MATTHEW M. WERDEGAR DOROTHY R. McLAUGHLI BENEDICT Y. HUR - #22401 710 Sansome Street San Francisco, CA 94111-170 Telephone: (415) 391-5400 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188  [Additional Counsel listed on statement of the country of the co	R - #200470 N - #229453 8 04 signature page]	S DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
12					
13	CAROL LOEB SHLOSS,		Case No. CV 06-37	718 (JW) (HRL)	
14		Plaintiff,	DECLARATION MCLAUGHLIN 1	OF DOROTHY R. IN SUPPORT OF	
15	V.	•.	CONSIDER WHI	VE MOTION TO ETHER CASES SHO	ULD
16 17	SEÁN SWEENEY, in his capacity as trustee of the Estate of James Joyce, and THE ESTATE OF JAMES JOYCE,		BE RELATED		
18		Defendants.	Judge: The Honor	able James Ware	
19			Date Comp. Filed:	June 12, 2006	
20	CAROL LOEB SHLOSS,		Case No. C 07-005	17 (MEJ)	
21		Plaintiff,			
22	V.			able Magistrate Judge	
23	STEPHEN JAMES JOYCE, in capacity and in his capacity as		Maria Elena		
24	The Estate of James Joyce,	<b>-</b>	Date Comp. Filed:	January 25, 2007	
25		Defendant.			
26					
27					
28					
	DECLARATION OF DOROTH	V R MCI AIICHI I	N IN SUPPORT OF ADM	IINISTRATIVE MOTION '	TO

#### 1

## 2

# 3

### 5

# 67

#### 8

## 9

# 1011

### 12

## 13

### 14

### 15

#### 16

#### 17

#### 18

#### 19

#### 20

### 21

#### 22

# 2324

## 25

#### 26

# 2728

#### I, DOROTHY R. MCLAUGHLIN, declare and state:

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of California and am an associate with the law firm of Keker & Van Nest LLP ("KVN"), representing the plaintiff in the above-captioned proceeding. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called to testify as a witness thereto, could do so competently under oath.
- 2. On January 29, 2007, I delivered by email a conformed copy of the complaint in *Shloss v. Stephen James Joyce*, Case No. C 07-00517 (MEJ), asking if counsel (Maria K. Nelson) for Sean Sweeney, trustee for the Estate of James Joyce ("Estate"), and the Estate would accept service of the complaint on Stephen Joyce's behalf.
- 3. Nelson responded the next day, January 30, 2007, with an email stating that she would consider the request.
- 4. On February 13, 2007 around 1 p.m., I sent an email to Nelson, attaching a proposed stipulation pursuant to Local Rules 3-12, 7-11, and 7-12, asking if Nelson would stipulate to seeking this Court's consideration of the above-mentioned cases as related under Local Rule 3-12.
- 5. On February 13, 2007, around 4:30 p.m., I left a voicemail message for Nelson, asking if she would stipulate to this Court's consideration of these cases as related.
- 6. On Thursday, February 15, 2007, Nelson responded in an email that she will not accept service of the complaint in *Shloss v. Stephen James Joyce*, Case No. C 07-00517 (MEJ), on behalf of Stephen Joyce.
- 7. Also on Thursday, February 15, 2007, Nelson stated in an email that *Shloss v*. *Stephen James Joyce*, Case No. C 07-00517 (MEJ), and *Shloss v*. *Sweeney*, Case No. CV 06-3718 (JW) (HRL), should be related.
- 8. Because Nelson has not accepted service on Joyce's behalf and Joyce, who resides overseas, has not yet been served, I have not been able to obtain a stipulation concerning this motion.
  - 9. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, this declaration is thus submitted as an explanation

	Case 5.06-cv-03716-3vv Document 63 Filed 02/15/2007 Page 3 of 3				
1	of why a stipulation could not be obtained.				
2	I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing				
3	is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on February 15, 2007 at San Francisco,				
4	California.				
5	/S/ DOROTHY R. MCLAUGHLIN				
6	DOROTHY R. MCLAUGHLIN				
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28	2				
	DECLARATION OF DOROTHY R. MCLAUGHLIN IN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED				