

1 Daniel H. Fingerman (SBN 229683)
 MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.
 2 River Park Tower
 333 W. San Carlos Street, Suite 1650
 3 San Jose, CA 95110
 Tel: (408) 279-7000
 4 Fax: (408) 998-1473

E-Filed 02/17/2010

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 San Francisco Technology, Inc.

6 Daralyn J. Durie (SBN 169825)
 7 Ryan M. Kent (SBN 220441)
 DURIE TANGRI LLP
 8 217 Leidesdorff Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 9 Tel: (415) 362-6666
 Fax: (415) 236-6300
 10 ddurie@durietangri.com
 rkent@durietangri.com

11 Attorneys for Defendant
 12 Pavestone Company LP

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17 SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.,

Case No. 5:09 cv-06083 RS

18 Plaintiff,

**STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO
 ANSWER COMPLAINT AND
 19 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

19 v.

20 ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED, THE
 BRITA PRODUCTS COMPANY, DELTA
 21 FAUCET COMPANY, EVANS
 MANUFACTURING, INC., THE EVERCARE
 22 COMPANY, GRAPHIC PACKAGING
 INTERNATIONAL INC., MAGNUM
 23 RESEARCH INC., PAVESTONE COMPANY
 LP, THE PROCTOR & GAMBLE COMPANY,
 24 S.C. JOHNSON & SON INC., SPECTRUM
 25 BRANDS INC., SUPER SWIM CORP.,
 26 UNILOCK INC., WEST COAST CHAIN
 MFG. CO.,

27 Defendants.

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 6-1 (a), Plaintiff San Francisco Technology Inc. stipulates and agrees
2 that Defendant Pavestone Company LP (“Pavestone”) will have until March 1, 2010, to answer or
3 otherwise respond to the Complaint filed by Plaintiff. This change will not alter the date of any event
4 or any deadline already fixed by Court order.

5 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the parties
6 appearing below through their undersigned respective attorneys, that Pavestone will have until March
7 1, 2010, to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint.

8
9 Dated: February 16, 2010

DURIE TANGRI LLP

10
11
12 By: /s/ Ryan M. Kent
RYAN M. KENT

13
14 Attorneys for Defendant
Pavestone Company LP

15
16 MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.

17 By: /s/ Daniel H. Fingerman
18 DANIEL H. FINGERMAN
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
San Francisco Technology, Inc.

20 **FILER’S ATTESTATION**

21 Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I, Ryan M. Kent, attest
22 that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.

23
24 /s/ Ryan M. Kent
RYAN M. KENT

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 17, 2010



HON. RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am employed in the City of San Francisco, County San Francisco, State of California, I am
3 over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 217 Leidesdorff
4 Street, San Francisco, CA 94111. On February 16, 2010, I caused copies of the attached
5 STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO ANSWER COMPLAINT to be served on:

6 All parties with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system.

7 In addition, I caused a copy of the attached STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO ANSWER
8 COMPLAINT to be served on the following person(s) in this action by placing a true copy thereof
9 enclosed in sealed envelope and addressed as follows:

10 Mark B. Garred
11 Stetina Brunda Garred & Brucker
12 75 Enterprise, Suite 250
13 Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
(949)855-1246

14 X (BY FIRST CLASS MAIL) I caused each such envelope to the addressee(s) noted above, with
15 postage thereon fully prepaid, to be placed in the United States mail in San Francisco,
16 California. I am readily familiar with the practice of Durie Tangri LLP for collection and
17 processing of correspondence for mailing, said practice being that in the ordinary course of
18 business mail is deposited in the United States Postal Service the same date as it is placed for
19 collection.

20 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
21 true and correct. Executed on February 16, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

22 _____
23 /s/ Colette Aragon
24 Colette Aragon
25
26
27
28