

1 John R. Till SBN 178763 JTill@PaladinLaw.com
 2 Bret A. Stone SBN 190161 BStone@PaladinLaw.com
 3 Brian R. Paget SBN 168694 BPaget@PaladinLaw.com
 4 PALADIN LAW GROUP® LLP
 5 1176 Boulevard Way
 6 Walnut Creek, California 94595
 7 Telephone: (925) 947-5700
 8 Facsimile: (925) 935-8488

9 Counsel for Plaintiff
 10 GREEN VALLEY CORPORATION

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14 GREEN VALLEY CORPORATION,
 15 Plaintiff,
 16 vs.
 17 CALDO OIL COMPANY, *et al.*,
 18 Defendants.

19 AND RELATED COUNTER, CROSS AND
 20 THIRD PARTY CLAIMS.

Case No. 09-CV-04028-LHK
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING
 PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO SHORTEN
 TIME FOR BRIEFING AND HEARING
 ON MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 2
 (Dkt. Nos. 135, 136)
 Civ. L.R. 6-3 AS MODIFIED

21 Plaintiff Green Valley Corporation (“Plaintiff”) moves this Court to shorten time for briefing and
 22 hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion in Limine No. 2 to Exclude Defendants’ Expert, David Hoexter, *see* Dkt.
 23 Nos. 135 & 136, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3.

24 Having considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition, if any, to the motion to shorten
 25 time, and good cause appearing, the Court rules as follows:

26 The Court finds: (1) the underlying motion *in limine* presents a single, discrete issue that can be
 27 briefed quickly and easily; (2) with the expert discovery cutoff date of September 30, 2011 fast
 28 approaching, Plaintiff needs a quick decision on its motion *in limine* so that, if the motion *in limine* is
 granted, Plaintiff will be able to avoid the time and expense of taking David Hoexter’s deposition; and
 (3) shortening time as requested will not prejudice the parties or adversely affect the case schedule.



1 Therefore, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's motion to shorten time.

2 Defendants Caldo Oil Company, Victor J. LoBue, The Victor J. LoBue Trust, The LoBue Living
3 Trust, The LoBue Family Trust, The Estate of Salvadore R. LoBue, Deceased, and The Estate of Tanie
4 Ann LoBue, Deceased shall have until Tuesday, September 13, 2011 to file its opposition to the motion
5 *in limine*.

6 Plaintiff shall have until Wednesday, September 14, 2011 to file its reply, if any, in support of its
7 motion *in limine*.

8 The Court sets no hearing date at this time and will attempt to resolve this issue on the
9 papers.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11
12 DATED: September 12, 2011



LUCY H. KOH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

(Case No. 09-CV-04028-LHK)

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

