

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

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
Kathleen M. Sullivan (CA Bar No. 242261)
kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood City, California 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

E-Filed 7/28/2011

Faith E. Gay (*pro hac vice*)
faithgay@quinnemanuel.com
Isaac Nesser (*pro hac vice*)
isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, New York 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Attorneys for Defendants Cisco Systems, Inc.,
John Chambers, Thomas Lam, and Owen Chan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

Doe I, Doe II, Ivy He, Doe III, Doe IV, Doe V,
Doe VI, ROE VII, Charles Lee, Roe VIII, Liu
Guifu, and those individuals similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Cisco Systems, Inc., John Chambers, Thomas
Lam, Owen Chan, and Does 1-100,

Defendants.

Case No. 5:11-cv-02449-JF-PSG

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER TO EXCEED APPLICABLE
PAGE LIMIT**

1 **WHEREAS**, Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint is scheduled to be filed on
2 August 4, 2011;

3 **WHEREAS**, Plaintiffs’ Class Action Complaint is 52 pages long and asserts fourteen
4 causes of action;

5 **WHEREAS**, the Plaintiffs and Defendants agree that the applicable 25-page limit for
6 briefs in support of and in opposition to Defendants’ forthcoming Motion to Dismiss the
7 Complaint is insufficient to address the claims and issues raised in the Complaint; and

8 **WHEREAS**, the Plaintiffs and Defendants further agree that the applicable 15-page limit
9 for Defendants’ reply brief in support of their forthcoming Motion to Dismiss the Complaint is
10 insufficient to address the claims and issues raised in the Complaint; and

11 **WHEREAS**, the Plaintiffs and Defendants further agree that extending the page limit will
12 allow the parties to address adequately each claim and issue, and assist the Court in efficiently and
13 effectively resolving Defendants’ forthcoming Motion to Dismiss the Complaint;

14 **NOW, THEREFORE**, the Parties stipulate as follows:

15 1. Defendants’ opening brief in support of their Motion to Dismiss the Complaint, and
16 Plaintiffs’ brief in opposition that Motion, may each be a maximum of 50 pages of text, excluding
17 tables of contents, tables of authorities, and supporting documents.

18 2. Defendants’ reply brief in further support of their Motion to Dismiss the Complaint
19 may be a maximum of 20 pages of text, excluding tables of contents, tables of authorities, and
20 supporting documents.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
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

DATED: July 22, 2011

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Kathleen M. Sullivan

Kathleen M. Sullivan
kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
Faith E. Gay
faithgay@quinnemanuel.com
Isaac Nesser
isaacnesser@quinnemanuel.com

Attorneys for Defendants

SCHWARCZ RIMBERG BOYD & RADER, LLP

By /s/ K. Kee Boyd

K. Kee Boyd*
lboyd@srbr-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

HUMAN RIGHTS LAW FOUNDATION


By /s/ Terri M. Marsh

Terri M. Marsh*
terri.marsh@hrhf.net

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 28, 2011

Hon. Jeremy Fogel 

* I have obtained signatory's consent to file this stipulation and proposed order.