David C. Powell (SBN 129781) 1 **E-Filed 7/7/2011** Email: dpowell@reedsmith.com Heather B. Hoesterey (SBN 201254) 2 Email: hhoesterey@reedsmith.com 3 REED SMITH LLP 101 Second Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94105-3659 4 Telephone: +1 415 543 8700 Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269 5 Attorneys for Defendant Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, 6 Fenner & Smith, Inc. 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 12 ELWOOD OUESADA, JAMES DeROSA, and Case No. CV-11-01703 JF Others Similarly Situated, 13 STIPULATED REQUEST AND Plaintiffs, PROPOSED ORDER TO CONTINUE 14 CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE 15 VS. Date: July 8, 2011 BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT Time: 10:30 a.m. 16 SERVICES, INC., NKA MERRILL LYNCH, Courtroom: 3 PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC, 17 The Honorable Jeremy Fogel Defendant. 18 19 20 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND REQUESTED, by and between Plaintiffs Elwood 21 Quesada and James DeRosa ("collectively "Plaintiffs") and defendant Banc of America Investment 22 Services, Inc., now known as Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. ("Merrill Lynch"), 23 through their respective attorneys of record, and based upon good cause, that the Court may make 24 and issue its Order Continuing the Case Management Conference in this matter, currently set for 10: 25 a.m. on July 8, 2011, until September 9, 2011, or such other date as the Court is available. Good 26 cause exists for this request, as follows: 27 28

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

(1) On or about February 7, 2011 Plaintiffs filed a Complaint against Bank of America Corporation ("BAC") in the Superior Court for the State of California county of Santa Clara, case number 111CV193724. BAC removed the action to this court and filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint; (2) In response to BAC's Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint on or about May 11, 2011. In the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs dismissed BAC and alleged claims against Merrill Lynch; (3) On or about May 16, 2011 Merrill Lynch, by and through its counsel, executed a Waiver of Service of Summons of the Amended Complaint in this matter; (4) The time for Merrill Lynch to respond to the Amended Complaint will not have run as of the July 8, 2011 date, Merrill Lynch will not have appeared, and the matter will not be at issue; (5) Plaintiffs' counsel is unavailable on July 8, 2011. (6) The parties request this continuance and believe there is good cause for this continuance because the parties believe a Rule 26(f) conference will be more efficient, the parties will be better able to assess the issues, and the parties will be able to present this Court with a more informative and reasoned report under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rules 16(b) and 26 and Local Rule 16-9 after Merrill Lynch has appeared in this action and responded to the Amended Complaint. DATED: June 29, 2011 LAW OFFICES OF JON E. DRUCKER By / s / Jon E. Drucker Jon E. Drucker Attorneys for Plaintiffs Elwood Quesada and James DeRosa DATED: June 29, 2011 REED SMITH LLP

/ s / Heather B. Hoesterey

Attorneys for Defendant Merrill, Lynch, Pierce,

Heather B. Hoesterey

Fenner & Smith, Inc.

[PROPOSED] ORDER

DATED: ______

THE HOLFORABLE E TO FOSEL UNITED STATES D STRICT JUDGE