

1 RANDALL W. EDWARDS (S.B. #179053)
 redwards@omm.com
 2 JEAN NIEHAUS (S.B. #254891)
 jniehaus@omm.com
 3 O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
 4 San Francisco, California 94111-3823
 Telephone: (415) 984-8700
 5 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701

6 Attorneys for Defendant
 Google Inc.

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 10 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

12 PALOMA GAOS, et al.
 13 Plaintiffs,
 14 v.
 15 GOOGLE INC.,
 16 Defendant.

Case No. 5:10-cv-04809-EJD

**STIPULATED REQUEST FOR
 ORDER CHANGING TIME FOR
 MOTION TO DISMISS BRIEFING**

Honorable Edward J. Davila

17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Google Inc. submits this stipulated request to adjust the briefing schedule on the motion to
2 dismiss in a manner that will not affect the previously established hearing date, which is
3 scheduled for September 21, 2012.

4 Whereas Plaintiffs Paloma Gaos and Anthony Italiano filed the Second Amended
5 Complaint (“SAC”) in the above-captioned action on May 1, 2012;

6 Whereas under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Google was required to answer or
7 otherwise respond to the SAC no later than May 15, 2012;

8 Whereas counsel for Google has previously communicated its intention to file a motion to
9 dismiss to counsel for Plaintiffs, and it obtained September 21, 2012 for a hearing date on that
10 motion.

11 Whereas the parties stipulated both to a schedule for the motion to dismiss briefing to
12 provide the parties adequate time to brief the issues presented in this case;

13 Whereas on May 9, 2012, the Court granted the parties’ previous stipulation and stipulated
14 request for extension under which Google’s motion to dismiss the SAC was due May 30, 2012,
15 Plaintiffs’ opposition was due July 3, 2012, and Google’s reply was due July 17, 2012;

16 Whereas the parties have agreed that short extension of the briefing schedule is
17 appropriate to provide time to discuss certain issues in advance, and the extension would not
18 affect the previously set hearing date and would still allow approximately seven weeks between
19 the reply brief and the hearing date;

20 Now, therefore, Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-1(b) and 6-2, and as supported by the
21 Declaration of Randall W. Edwards, the parties make the following stipulated request:

22 Google’s motion to dismiss the SAC will be due no later than June 15, 2012;

23 Plaintiffs’ opposition to Google’s motion to dismiss will be due no later than July 19,
24 2012;

25 Google’s reply in further support of its motion to dismiss will be due no later than August
26 2, 2012.

27 This stipulated extension and briefing schedule will not affect the date of any event or
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

deadline already fixed by the Court in this case.

Dated: May 30, 2012

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

By: /s/ Randall W. Edwards
Randall W. Edwards
Attorneys for Defendant
Google Inc.

Dated: May 30, 2012

ASCHENBRENER LAW, P.C.
NASSIRI & JUNG LLP

By: /s/ Michael J. Aschenbrener
Michael J. Aschenbrener
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Paloma Gaos

Filer's Attestation: In compliance with General Order 45(X)(B), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this Stipulation has been obtained from Michael Aschenbrener.

Dated: May 30, 2012

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

By: /s/ Randall W. Edwards
Randall W. Edwards
Attorneys for Defendant
Google Inc.