1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
10	United States of America, NO. C 09-05873 JW	
11	Plaintiff, ORDER CONTINUING PRELIMINARY v. PRETRIAL CONFERENCE	
12	Cardi M. Prinzi, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14	/	
15	This case is scheduled for a Preliminary Pretrial Conference on September 27, 2010. On	
16	September 20, 2010, the parties filed a Stipulated and [Proposed] Order Continuing Dates and	
17	Deadlines. (See Docket Item No. 22.)	
18	In their Stipulation, the parties represent that they have a further ADR conference currently	
19	set for October 13, 2010. (See Docket Item No. 22.) In light of their ongoing settlement	
20	negotiations, the parties request the following extensions:	
21	(1) Continuance of the September 27, 2010 Preliminary Pretrial Conference until December 20, 2010.	
22	(2) Extension of the October 29, 2010 close of discovery until January 28, 2011.	
23	(3) Extension of the last day to file dispositive motions from December 13, 2010 until	
24	March 28, 2011.	
25	Upon review, the Court finds good cause to continue the September 27 Preliminary Pretrial	
26	Conference until after the parties attend their further ADR conference. Accordingly, the Court	
27		
28		

CONTINUES the September 27 Conference to October 25, 2010 11 a.m.¹ On or before October
 15, 2010, the parties shall file a Joint Preliminary Pretrial Statement. The Statement shall include,
 among other things, the parties' proposed trial schedule and an update on the parties' ADR efforts.

The Court, however, declines the parties' request to extend the deadlines for close of
discovery and for hearing dispositive motions at this time. The Court finds no reason as to why the
parties cannot engage in ADR efforts and discovery in tandem to meet the Court's deadlines.
Accordingly, the Court DENIES the parties' request for extension as to all other pretrial deadlines,
which shall remain as previously ordered.

10 Dated: September 21, 2010

ames What

JAMES WARE United States District Judge

¹ In light of the Court's Order, Defendants' Motion to Appear By Telephone is DENIED as moot. (See Docket Item No. 21.)

United States District Court For the Northern District of California United States District Court For the Northern District of California

 THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVER Cynthia Lewis Stier cynthia.stier@usdoj.gov leffrey Peters Coleman jeff@colemanlaw.com Dated: September 21, 2010 Richard W. Wicking, Clerk By: /s/ JW Chambers Elizabeth Garcia Courtroom Deputy 	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED		
3 Jated: September 21, 2010 Richard W. Wicking, Clerk 5 By: /s/ JW Chambers 6 Elizabeth Garcia 7 Courtroom Deputy 8			
4 Dated: September 21, 2010 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk 5 By:	Jeffrey Peters Coleman jeff@coleman	nlaw.com	
5 6 6 7 7 8 9 10 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 16 17 18 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24 25 26		Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy			
Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy Courtroom Deputy	5	By: <u>/s/ JW Chambers</u> Elizabeth Garcia	
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	7	Courtroom Deputy	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	3		
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	9		
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 210 210 211 212 213 214 215 <td>D</td> <td></td>	D		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	1		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	2		
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	3		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	4		
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	5		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	5		
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	7		
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	3		
21 22 23 24 25 26	9		
22 23 24 25 26)		
23 24 25 26	1		
24 25 26	2		
25 26	3		
26	4		
	5		
27	5		
	7		
28	3		