3	KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC GEORGE R. KINGSLEY, ESQ. SE ERIC B. KINGSLEY, ESQ. SBN- eric@kingsleykingsley.com 16133 VENTURA BL., SUITE 1200 ENCINO, CA 91436 (818) 990-8300, FAX (818) 990-2903	185123)
5	CHARLES JOSEPH, ESQ. FED BA	AR #CJ-9442
6	JOSEPH & HERZFELD LLP 233 BROADWAY, 5 TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10279	
7	NEW YORK, NY 10279 (212) 688-5640; FAX (212) 688-2548	8
8	Seeking Admission Pro Hac Vice	
9	MATTHEW D. BRINCKERHOFF EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF	ESQ. FED BAR # F & ARADY LLP
	75 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, 20th NEW YORK, NY 10019	
11	(212) 763-5000; FAX (212) 763-5001	1
	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
13	Attorneys for Trainting	
14	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
15		
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF	CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
17		
18	PHILIP M. CONTRERAS, on behalf of himself and all others) CASE NO.: CV 09-3405-JF
19	similarly situated,) STIPULATION TO STAY ACTION
20	Plaintiffs,	AND ORDER
21	V.	
22		
23	PFIZER INC., a Delaware corporation, doing business in)
24	California as PFIZER PRODUCTS,)
	INC.; and DOES 1 to 50, Inclusive,	
25	Defendants.)
26)
27		
28		

1

THE	$\mathbf{p}_{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}$	RT	TFC	H	$\mathbf{F}\mathbf{R}$	E.	R٦	V	CT	ГΤ	P	T T	T	Δ٦	$\Gamma \mathbf{F}$	Δ	S	H	'n	T.	T.	O	V	VS	١.
	\perp	11/1	LLO		יוע	VU.	D I	L	J	L		U.	11	-	ייו		717	· I'	•	1		ι,		V 1.	,

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that all parties desire to stay the proceedings in 3 this action pending the outcome of three appeals that directly implicate the central 4 issue in this case, i.e., whether pharmaceutical sales representatives are properly 5 classified as exempt from Cal. Labor Code overtime requirements under either the outside sales or administrative exemptions. See D'Este v. Bayer, 07-56577, Barnick 6 7 v. Wyeth, 07-56684, Menes v. Roche, 08-55286 (consolidated 9th Circuit appeals); In 8 Re Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation, No. 09-0437 (2nd Cir.). A stay of this action 9 pending a decision concerning the applicability of the outside sales and/or 10 administrative exemptions under California and federal law will promote efficiency 11 and conserve the resources of the court and the parties.

On February 11, 2009, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals heard oral argument in the consolidated cases of *Menes v. Roche*, 08-55286, *D'Este v. Bayer*, 07-56577, and *Barnick v. Wyeth*, 07-56684. In all three appeals, the district courts had awarded summary judgment to defendants based on the outside sales exemption under California law.

17 On May 5, 2009, the Ninth Circuit certified two questions to the California 18 Supreme Court, addressing both the outside sales and the administrative exemptions 19 as applied to pharmaceutical representatives. On June 10, 2009, the California 20 Supreme Court denied the Ninth Circuit's request. On July 15, 2009, the Ninth 21 Circuit entered an order withdrawing Menes v. Roche, 08-55286, D'Este v. Bayer, 07-22 56577, and Barnick v. Wyeth, 07-56684 from submission pending issuance of the 23 mandate in Harris v. Superior Court, No. 515655, review granted by 171 P.3d 545 24 (Cal. 2007). The consolidated cases will be resubmitted to the Ninth Circuit within 25 twenty days of the California Supreme Court's decision in *Harris v. Superior Court*.

26

1

12

13

14

15

16

27

- 1 On July 6, 2010, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion in *In*
- 2 Re Novartis Wage and Hour Litigation, No. 09-0437 (2nd Cir.), 611 F.3d 141 (2010).
- 3 This case involves the applicability of the outside sales exemption and the
- 4 administrative exemption to pharmaceutical representatives under the Fair Labor and
- 5 Standards Act ("FLSA"), New York state law, and California state law. The Ninth
- 6 Circuit looking at an issue of federal law recently ruled that sales exemption applied
- 7 to pharmaceutical sales reps Christopher v. Smith Kline & Beecham (9th Cir. 2011)
- 8 635 F.3d 383. Plaintiff are in the process of filing a writ of certiorari to the United
- 9 States Supreme Court.
- The Second Circuit held that the pharmaceutical representatives were not
- 11 exempt under the outside sales exemption or the administrative exemption. The bulk
- 12 of the Court's analysis relied on the exemptions under the FLSA. However, the
- 13 Second Circuit went on to note that the overtime wage requirements of "New York
- 14 law and California law are not meaningfully different from the requirements of the
- 15 FLSA." In re Novartis Wage & Hour Litigation., 09-0437-CV, 2010 WL 2667337
- *15 (2d Cir. July 6, 2010). The defendant filed a Petition for Review to the United
- 17 States Supreme Court, which was denied on February 28, 2011. See Novartis
- 18 *Pharmaceuticals Corp. v. Lopes*, 131 S.CT. 1568 (2011).
- The decision in *In re Novartis Wage & Hour Litigation*, is obviously not
- 20 binding on this Court. However, in the interest of providing this Court with a full
- 21 status report of the state of the law regarding the core issues in this case, Plaintiff felt
- 22 it was necessary to provide the Court with this information.
- Other federal district courts have stayed similar cases concerning the
- 24 classification of pharmaceutical sales representatives pending appeals in related
- 25 actions. See Silverman v. GlaxoSmithKline PLC, 06 cv 7272 DSF (C.D. Cal. Dec. 17,
- 26 2008) [Dkt. No. 188]; Thorpe v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., 5:07-cv-05672 RMW

27 28

(N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2009) [Dkt. No. 54]. Brody v. Astrazeneca Pharmaceuticals, LP, 08-56120 (9th Cir. Mar. 3, 2009). Moreover, neither party would be prejudiced by a 2 stay in this action. 3 Wherefore, the parties respectfully request that the Court approve this 4 stipulation for a Stay of Proceedings, and continue the Status Conference set for 5 August 19, 2011, pending the resolution of one or both of the aforementioned 6 7 appeals. IT IS SO STIPULATED 9 **DATED:** August 12, 2011 10 11 KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC 12 By: /s/ Eric B. Kingsley 13 ERIC B. KINGSLEY 14 Attorney for Plaintiff 15 16 **DATED:** August 12, 2011 17 LITTLER MENDELSON 18 By: /s/ Kimberly J. Gost 19 PHILIP A. SIMPKINS 20 KIMBERLY J. GOST (Admitted *pro hac vice*) 21 Attorneys for Defendants 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. The status conference is continued to 2/24/12. 23 24 DATED:_8/16/11 25 JEREMY FO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 26 27 28

STIPULATION TO STAY ACTION