1	DANIEL S. MOUNT (Cal. Bar No. 77517)	**E-Filed 10/22/08**		
2	On Lu (Cal. Bar No. 242693)			
3	KEVIN M. PASQUINELLI (Cal. Bar No. 246985) MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.			
4	RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650 333 West San Carlos Street			
5	San Jose CA 95110-2740 Phone: (408) 279-7000; Fax: (408) 998-1473 Email: dmount@mount.com; olu@mount.com; kpasquinelli@mount.com			
6				
7	Attorneys for Defendants,			
8	SHUTTLE INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP INC.			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	LENOVO (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD.,	Case No. 5:08-CV-3454 (JF)		
12	Plaintiff,			
13	v.	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO EXTEND CMC AND ADR		
14	SHUTTLE INC.	DEADLINES DEADLINES		
15	and	HON. JUDGE JEREMY FOGEL		
16	SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP INC.,	U.S. District Court Judge		
17	Defendants.			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

Case No. 5:08-CV-3454 (JF)

Pursuant to Civil L.Rs. 6-2 and 7-12, Plaintiff Lenovo (SINGAPORE) PTE LTD. ("Plaintiff"), and Defendants Shuttle Inc. and Shuttle Computer Group Inc. (together "Defendants"), respectfully request the Court to enter an Order extending the Parties' CMC and ADR deadlines. In support of this Stipulation, the Parties state as follows:

- 1. On July 17, 2008, Plaintiff filed its Complaint in the Northern District of California.
- 2. On Aug. 18, 2008, this case was reassigned to Judge Fogel.
- 3. On Sep. 26, 2008, the Parties filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order enlarging Defendants' time to reply to Plaintiff's Complaint to Dec. 1, 2008. Judge Fogel granted this request on Oct. 10, 2008.
- 4. On Sep. 30, 2008, before the extension was granted by Judge Fogel, the Court noticed the CMC for Oct. 31, 2008. As a result, the CMC is scheduled to occur before Defendants' reply is due on Dec. 1, 2008. Defendants may file a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction in reply to Plaintiff's Complaint. Therefore, Defendants suggest that a CMC before Judge Fogel would not be appropriate until after Defendants file their reply.
- 5. The Parties therefore stipulate that the CMC should occur after Defendants reply to Plaintiff's Complaint. The parties respectfully submit that either December 5 would be an appropriate date for the CMC, if the Court's schedule permits. If December 5 is not available, the parties request a setting on December 12 or as soon thereafter as the Court will permit.
 - 6. This stipulation expresses the intent and understanding of both parties.

FOR THE ABOVE REASONS, the parties respectfully request the Court to enter an Order extending the Parties' CMC and ADR deadlines as follows:

- 7. <u>Friday, Nov. 14, 2008:</u> Last day to:
 - a. Meet and confer re: initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection; and discovery plan;
 - b. File ADR Certification signed by Parties and Counsel;

1	c. File either Stipulation to ADR Process or Notice of Need for ADR Phone		
2	Conference.		
3	8. Wednesday, November 26, 2008: Last day to file Rule 26(f) report; complete initial		
4	disclosures or state objections; and file CMC Statement.		
5	9. Friday, Dec. 5, 2008: Initial CMC.		
6			
7	Rea	spectfully submitted,	
8			
9	Dated: October <u>21</u> , 2008 MC	OUNT & STOELKER, P.C.	
10	Ву	: /s/ On Lu	
11	DA	NIEL S. MOUNT	
12	ON KE	LU VIN M. PASQUINELLI	
13	Att SH	VIN M. PASQUINELLI orneys for Defendants SHUTTLE INC. and UTTLE COMPUTER GROUP INC.	
14			
15			
16	Dated: October 21, 2008 AK	IN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP	
17	Ву	s /s/ Fred I. Williams	
18		ED I. WILLIAMS orney for Plaintiff	
19		NOVO (SINGAPORE) PTE. LTD.	
20			
21			
22	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
23			
24	Dated: 10/22/08		
25	НС	N. JUDGE JEREMY FOGEL	
26	Un No	ited States District Court Judge rthern District of California	
27			
28	2		

Case No. 5:08-CV-3454 (JF)

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER

1	As the attorney e-filing this document, I hereby attest that Fred I. Williams, attorney for Lenovo		
2	(Singapore) PTE. Ltd. has concurred in this filing.		
3			
4	Dated: October 21, 2008	MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.	
5		By:/s/ On Lu	
6		ON LU	
7		Attorney for Defendants SHUTTLE INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP INC.	
8		SHOTTLE COMPOTER GROOT INC.	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26 27			
28			
۷٥		3	

Case No. 5:08-CV-3454 (JF)

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER