Boyd v. Accuray, Inc			
1 2	PETER C. McMAHON (State Bar No. 161841) KATHERINE DEBSKI (State Bar No. 271528) MCMAHON SEREPCA LLP 985 Industrial Road, Suite 201		
3	San Carlos, CA 94070 Telephone: (650) 637-0600 Facsimile: (650) 637-0700		
4	Facsimile: (650) 637-0700 Email: peter@msllp.com; katherine@msllp.com		
.5	Attorneys for Defendant		
6	ACCUŘAY, INC.		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10			
11	Michael E. Boyd,	Case No. 5:11-cv-01644-LHK	
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO	
13	V.	EXCEED PAGE LIMITS	
14	Accuray, Inc.,	ESTABLISHED BY THE COURT'S LOCAL RULES [7.2 AND 7.4] FOR	
15	Defendant.	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
16		Version	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS ESTABLISHED BY THE COURT'S LOCAL RULES [7.2 AND 7.4] FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT		
	1		

Doc. 41

Defendant Accuray, Inc. ("Defendant") and Plaintiff Michael Boyd ("Plaintiff"), by and through their counsel, and subject to the Court's approval, stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint ("FAC") contains five (5) causes of action for Retaliation, including (i) under the Fair Labor Standards Act; (ii) under the Federal False Claims Act; (iii) under the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended; (iv) under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and (v) under the whistleblower provisions of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act; and

WHEREAS, the FAC asserts relevant facts and causes of action spanning more than four (4) years of time, and which contain multiple complaints, and multiple allegations of retaliatory conduct over the four year period; and

WHEREAS, the parties agree that the FAC's scope and complexity warrant a modest increase in the page limits imposed by this Court's Local Orders for Defendant's opening brief and Plaintiff's opposition brief to Defendants' motion for summary judgment, and Defendant's reply brief.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES, subject to the Court's approval, that:

- Defendant's' memorandum of law in support of its motion for summary judgment shall not exceed 35 pages (or as otherwise indicated by the Court);
 and
- Plaintiffs memorandum of law in opposition to Defendant's motion for summary judgment shall not exceed 37 pages (or as otherwise indicated by the Court); and
- Defendant's reply brief in support of its motion for summary judgment shall not exceed 17 pages (or as otherwise indicated by the Court).

27 ///

1	Dated: March 202012	MCMAHON SEREPCA LLP
2		
3		s/ Peter C. McMahon
4		Peter C. McMahon, Esq.
5		Attorneys for Accuray, Inc.
6	Dated: March 19, 2012	MEIR WESTREICH
7		
8		s/ Meir J. Westreich
9		
10		Meir J. Westreich, Esq. Attorneys for Michael Boyd
11	TDDODOSE	D ORDER
12	Having reviewed the above stipular	
13		ipulation, THE STH CEATION IS DENIED.
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		IT IS SO ORDERED.
19		full Val
20	Dated: March 21, 2012	The Honorable Lucy Koh
21		United States District Judge
22		TES DISTRICT
23		
24 25		IT IS SO ORDERED AS MODIFIED AS MODIFIED
26		Z July H. Koh
27		Judgestucy Judgestucy DISTRICT OF CAN
ott (f)		101 KIO

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS ESTABLISHED BY THE COURT'S LOCAL RULES [7.2 AND 7.4] FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT