Farhang v. Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur et al Doc. 450

SANJIV N. SINGH (SBN 193525)
E-mail: ssingh@sanjivnsingh.com
SANJIV N. SINGH, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
21 Columbus Avenue, Suite 205
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-296-0152
Facsimile: 415-358-4006

MICAH R. JACOBS (SBN 174630)
E-mail: mjacobs@jacobslawsf.com
JACOBS LAW GROUP SF
388 Market St., Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-445-4696
Facsimile: 415-445-4697

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
MANDANA D. FARHANG and M.A. MOBILE LTD.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

M.A. MOBILE LTD., a limited liability company chartered in Dominica, and MANDANA D. FARHANG, an individual Plaintiff, vs. INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KHARAGPUR; PARTHA P. CHAKRABARTI; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No.:**C08-02658 RMW HRL** **JOINT STIPULATION, ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION, DECLARATION OF MICAH R. JACOBS, AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER TO CONTINUE OCTOBER 18, 2013 HEARING DATE** Date: October 18, 2013 Time: 9:00 a.m. Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

Dockets.Justia.com

ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION and STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING

Pursuant to Local Rules 6-2, 7-7 and 7-11, Plaintiffs Mandana D. Farhang and M.A. Mobile Ltd. ("Plaintiffs"), and Defendants Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur and Partha P. Chakrabarti (collectively "Defendants") through their undersigned counsel, hereby submit this stipulation to continue the hearing date and administrative motion for an order continuing the hearing date on Plaintiffs' Motion in the Alternative for Jurisdictional Discovery of Defendants Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur and Partha Chakrabarti ("Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery") for two weeks, from October 18, 2013, to November 1, 2013.

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery on September 12, 2013;

WHEREAS, due to critical scheduling difficulties, Plaintiffs' counsel is unavailable for hearing on the Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery on October 18, 2013 and desires to continue that hearing date to November 1, 2013; and

WHEREAS, Defendants do not oppose continuing the hearing date to November 1, 2013, and have agreed and stipulated to continue the hearing for two weeks.

THEREFORE, Plaintiffs will and hereby do move the Court for an administrative order continuing Plaintiff's Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery for two weeks, until November 1, 2013. This motion is unopposed by Defendants, who hereby stipulate to continue the hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBS LAW GROUP SF

By */s/ Micah Jacobs*
Micah R. Jacobs
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

By */s/ Thomas Zellerbach*
Thomas Zellerbach
Attorneys for Defendants

DECLARATION OF MICAH R. JACOBS

I, Micah R. Jacobs, declare as follows:

1. I am a member of the State Bar of California and admitted to practice before this Court. I am counsel for the Plaintiffs in this action and am submitting this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' stipulation to continue the hearing date on Plaintiffs' Motion in the Alternative for Jurisdictional Discovery.
2. I make this declaration based upon my own personal knowledge, unless expressly stated otherwise.
3. This stipulation and administrative motion is to continue the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery for two weeks, from October 18, 2013 until November 1, 2013.
4. Due to critical scheduling difficulties and unanticipated professional commitments, Plaintiffs' counsel are unable to attend this hearing on October 18, 2013. I immediately contacted Counselor Zellerbach for Defendants, explained the situation and asked Defendants to stipulate to postpone the hearing date for two weeks. Defendants have agreed and stipulated to this brief continuance.
5. There have been no other changes to this particular motion since it was filed. I do not believe there would be any prejudice or impact on this case as a result of continuing this Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery for two weeks until November 1, 2013. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 15th day of October, 2013 in San Francisco, California.

/s/ Micah R. Jacobs

MICAH R. JACOBS

Filer's Attestation: Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5.1(i)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from its signatory.

Dated: October 14, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Micah R. Jacobs* /s/

Micah R. Jacobs

ORDER CONTINUING HEARING

GOOD CAUSE HAVING BEEN SHOWN, AND PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date for Plaintiffs' Motion for Jurisdictional Discovery shall be continued and set for hearing at 9:00 a.m. ON NOVEMBER 1, 2013.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

Ronald M. Whyte

Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
United States District Judge
Northern District of California