

1 DURIE TANGRI LLP  
 2 MICHAEL H. PAGE (SBN 154913)  
 3 mpage@durietangri.com  
 4 JOSEPH C. GRATZ (SBN 240676)  
 5 jgratz@durietangri.com  
 6 GENEVIEVE P. ROSLOFF (SBN 258234)  
 grosloff@durietangri.com  
 217 Leidesdorff Street  
 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Telephone: 415-362-6666  
 Facsimile: 415-236-6300

7 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
 8 ADMOB, INC.

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 In re iPhone Application Litigation

Case No.: 5:10-cv-05878-LHK (PSG)

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL H. PAGE IN  
 SUPPORT OF STIPULATION TO EXTEND  
 BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON DEFENDANTS'  
 MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 I, Michael H. Page, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in all courts in the State of California and am  
3 admitted to practice before the United States District Court, Northern District of California. I am a  
4 partner in the law firm of Durie Tangri LLP and am one of the attorneys responsible for the  
5 representation of Defendant AdMob, Inc. (“AdMob”) in this matter. I make this declaration of my own  
6 personal knowledge, unless the context indicates otherwise, and, if called as a witness, I could and would  
7 testify competently to the facts stated below.

8 2. By order dated May 31, 2011 (Dkt. No. 132), the Court ordered Defendants to file any  
9 anticipated motions to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint by June 13, 2011, Plaintiffs to file an  
10 opposition by July 11, 2011, Defendants to file a reply by July 25, 2011, and a set a hearing date of  
11 September 1, 2011 for such motions.

12 3. Given the common allegations against Defendants, AdMob and the other defendants are  
13 working to coordinate the filing of consolidated motions to dismiss rather than separate motions, for the  
14 convenience of the Court and all parties.

15 4. Counsel for all Defendants requested that Plaintiffs agree to extend the time to file their  
16 motions to dismiss by one week.

17 5. Plaintiffs’ counsel agreed to the extension so long as it would not materially delay the  
18 hearing of the motion.

19 6. Defendants have previously requested, and were granted, extensions of their respective  
20 deadlines to respond to the Consolidated Complaint, but no party has previously requested an extension  
21 of the briefing schedule on Defendants’ anticipated motion to dismiss as ordered by the Court on May  
22 31, 2011, and the requested extension will not alter the date of any other event or any other deadline  
23 already fixed by Court order.  
24

25 Dated: June 3, 2011 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
26 MICHAEL H. PAGE