

E-Filed 2/10/11

1 Kathryn G. Spelman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 154512)
 2 Daniel H. Fingerman, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 229683)
 3 Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P.C.
 4 RiverPark Tower, Suite 1650
 5 333 West San Carlos Street
 6 San Jose CA 95110-2740
 7 Phone: (408) 279-7000
 8 Fax: (408) 998-1473
 9 Email: kspelman@mount.com, dfingerman@mount.com

Counsel for Plaintiff San Francisco Technology Inc.

8 DURIE TANGRI LLP
 9 DARALYN J. DURIE (Bar No. 169825)
 10 RYAN M. KENT (Bar No. 154913)
 11 217 Leidesdorff Street
 12 San Francisco, CA 94111
 13 Phone: (415) 362-6666
 14 Fax: (415) 236-6300
 15 E-mail: ddurie@durietangri.com
 16 rkent@durietangri.com

13 SCHEEF & STONE, LLP
 14 JOHN G. FISCHER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 15 ERIC C. WOOD (*Pro Hac Vice*)
 16 500 N. Akard, Suite 2700
 17 Dallas, Texas 75201
 18 Phone: (214) 706-4200
 19 Fax: (214) 706-4242
 20 E-mail: john.fischer@solidcounsel.com
 21 E-mail: eric.wood@solidcounsel.com

Attorneys for Defendant
PAVESTONE COMPANY, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAVESTONE COMPANY, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:10-CV-01651-RS

**STIPULATION REGARDING
MOTION BRIEFING AND HEARING
SCHEDULE AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER**

JURY DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff San Francisco Technology Inc. (“SF Tech”) and Defendant Pavestone Company
2 LLC (“Pavestone”) (collectively the “Parties”) jointly submit this Stipulation and [Proposed]
3 Order for motion briefing and a hearing schedule. The Statement filed by Pavestone previously
4 on February 10, 2011 (Docket No. 26) is withdrawn. The Parties stipulate as follows:

5 1. On February 3, 2011, the Court held a case management conference (CMC) in this
6 case, jointly with other cases in which defendants were severed from *San Francisco Technology*
7 *Inc. v. Adobe Systems Inc.*, Case No. 5:09-cv-06083-RS (the former defendants in this case are
8 hereinafter referred to as the “Defendants”).

9 2. The Defendants have indicated that they intend to file motions to dismiss. At the
10 CMC, the Court directed the Defendants to meet and confer with SF Tech on a schedule for
11 briefing and hearing the motions to dismiss. The Defendants and SF Tech exchanged emails and
12 held a telephone conference call on the morning of February 7, 2011. During that conference
13 call, the Defendants and SF Tech agreed to the following schedule:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>
February 10, 2011	SF Tech will file its amended complaint against defendant Procter & Gamble in Case No. 5:10-cv-01652-RS
March 14, 2011	Deadline for Defendants to file motions to dismiss
May 5, 2011	Deadline for SF Tech to file oppositions to motions to dismiss
May 12, 2011	Deadline for Defendants to file replies
May 26, 2011, 1:30 p.m.	Hearing on motions to dismiss

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 3. The Parties jointly request that the Court adopt this schedule for the Defendants’
23 motions to dismiss.

24
25 4. Based on the Court’s statements during the CMC, it is Defendants’ position that
26 the Court has stayed all discovery in this case, including initial disclosures, while the motions to
27 dismiss are pending. SF Tech’s counsel does not recall the Court making that order during the
28 CMC and suggested deferring the issue of a discovery stay until later.

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 STIPULATED.

Dated: February 10, 2011.

Mount, Spelman & Fingerman, P.C.,

\s\ Daniel H. Fingerman
Counsel for Plaintiff
San Francisco Technology, Inc.


Dated: February 10, 2011.

Scheef & Stone, L.L.P.

\s\ Eric C. Wood
Eric C. Wood
Attorney for Defendant
Pavestone Company, LLC

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 2/10/11


The Honorable Richard Seeborg
U.S. District Judge