

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
 Claude M. Stern (Bar No. 96737)
 2 claudestern@quinnemanuel.com
 Evette Pennypacker (Bar No. 203515)
 3 evettepennypacker@quinnemanuel.com
 Thomas R. Watson (Bar No. 227264)
 4 tomwatson@quinnemanuel.com
 555 Twin Dolphin Dr., 5th floor
 5 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
 6 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

7 Joshua L. Sohn (Bar No. 250105)
 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
 8 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
 9 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

10 Attorneys for Defendant Fusion Garage PTE Ltd.

11 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
 Andrew P. Bridges (Bar No.: 122761)
 12 Abridges@winston.com
 David S. Bloch (SBN: 184530)
 13 Dbloch@winston.com
 Matthew A. Scherb (Bar No. 237461)
 14 mscherb@winston.com

15 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
 101 California Street, 39th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-5802
 16 Telephone: (415) 591-1000
 Facsimile: (415) 591-1400

17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Interserve, Inc., et al.

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 20 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 INTERSERVE, INC. dba TECHCRUNCH, a
 Delaware corporation, and CRUNCHPAD,
 INC., a Delaware corporation,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 FUSION GARAGE PTE. LTD, a Singapore
 25 company,

26 Defendant.

CASE NO. 09-cv-5812 RS (PVT)

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
 TIME REGARDING BRIEFING ON
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL**

1 WHEREAS, on September 7, 2010, Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Compel Production of
2 Withheld Information and Documents (Dkt. 164) (“Motion”);

3 WHEREAS, Fusion Garage’s Opposition to the Motion is currently due September 21,
4 2010, Plaintiffs’ Reply is due September 28, 2010, and the Motion hearing is set for October 12,
5 2010;

6 WHEREAS, the Fusion Garage attorney with primary responsibility for Fusion Garage’s
7 Opposition has been ill for the past several days and has been unable to effectively respond to
8 Plaintiffs’ motion during this time;

9 WHEREAS, due to this illness, Fusion Garage has sought Plaintiffs’ stipulation to a two-
10 day extension for Fusion Garage’s Opposition to the Motion;

11 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs agree to this stipulation, on the condition that Fusion Garage
12 stipulate to a corresponding two-day extension for Plaintiffs’ Reply to the Motion and that the
13 hearing currently set for October 12, 2010 remains on calendar;

14 WHEREAS, the following time modifications have been previously made in this case:
15 time to file a responsive pleading (Dkt. No. 16); motion to set the hearing dates on Fusion
16 Garage’s motion to dismiss, to strike, and for a more definite statement (“motion to dismiss”) and
17 Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction to May, 6, 2010 (Dkt. No. 45); motion to shorten
18 time to hear Fusion Garage’s motion to compel documents to support its opposition to Plaintiffs’
19 Motion for a preliminary injunction (Dkt. No. 55); and setting new hearing date on Plaintiffs’
20 motion for a preliminary injunction and defendant’s motion to dismiss (Dkt. 64).

21 WHEREAS, the brief extensions sought by this stipulation will not impact the currently-
22 scheduled hearing date for the Motion;

23 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties stipulate that Fusion Garage shall have a two-day
24 extension, until September 23, 2010, to file its Opposition to the Motion. The parties further
25 stipulate that Plaintiffs shall have a corresponding two-day extension, until September 30, 2010, to
26 file their Reply to the Motion. The hearing on Plaintiffs’ Motion—October 12, 2010—will remain
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILER'S ATTESTATION

Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I attest that I have obtained concurrence in the filing of this document from Matthew A. Sherb, counsel for Plaintiffs.

DATED: September 21, 2010

By: /s/ Thomas R. Watson
Thomas R. Watson