

1 KATHRYN LEE CRAWFORD-BOYD, ESQ. (SBN 189496)
lboyd@srbr-law.com

2 RAJIKA L. SHAH, ESQ. (SBN 232994)
rshah@srbr-law.com

3 **SCHWARCZ, RIMBERG, BOYD & RADER, LLP**
6310 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 360
4 Los Angeles, California 90048
Phone: (323) 302-9488, Fax: (323) 931-4990

5 TERRI MARSH, ESQ. (*pro hac vice*)
terri.marsh@hrhf.net

6 BRIAN PIERCE, ESQ. (*pro hac vice*)
brianp@hrhf.net

7 **HUMAN RIGHTS LAW FOUNDATION**
8 1615 L Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036
9 Phone: (202) 369-4977, Fax: (323) 931-4990

10 JUDITH BROWN CHOMSKY (*pro hac vice*)
jchomsky@igc.org

11 **LAW OFFICES OF JUDITH BROWN CHOMSKY**
8210 New Second Street
12 Elkins Park, PA 19027
Phone: (215) 782-8327, Fax: (215)782-8368

13 Attorneys for PLAINTIFFS

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
15 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

16 DOE I, DOE II, Ivy HE, DOE III, DOE
17 IV, DOE V, DOE VI, ROE VII, Charles
LEE, ROE VIII, and LIU Guifu, and
18 those individual similarly situated,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., John
22 CHAMBERS, Thomas LAM, Owen
23 CHAN, Fredy CHEUNG, and DOES 1-
24 100,

25 Defendants.

Case No. 5:11-cv-02449-EJD-PSGx
Assigned to the Hon. Edward J. Davila

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
RESCHEDULE BRIEFING**

[N.D. Cal. Local Rule 7-11]

Action Filed: May 19, 2011
FAC Filed: Sept. 2, 2011

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Upon the Motion to Reschedule Briefing submitted by Plaintiffs DOE I, DOE II, Ivy HE, DOE III, DOE IV, DOE V, DOE VI, ROE VII, Charles LEE, ROE VIII, and LIU Guifu (“Plaintiffs”), the Court, having considered the papers submitted, HEREBY ORDERS THAT:

1. Briefing on only the following three questions raised by the Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendants CISCO SYSTEMS, INC. (“Cisco”), John CHAMBERS (“Chambers”), Thomas LAM (“Lam”), Owen CHAN (“Chan”), and Fredy CHEUNG (“Cheung”) (“Defendants”) on September 23, 2011 (Docket Entry 67) (“Motion to Dismiss”) will continue on the current briefing schedule established in the Court’s Order dated October 11, 2011 (Docket Entry 74):¹ (1) whether the case presents a non-justiciable political question, (2) whether the complaint challenges an act of state, and (3) whether the case violates principles of international comity.

2. Briefing on all other issues raised by Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss is rescheduled until after the U.S. Supreme Court issues its decision in *Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co.* and *Mohamad v. Rajub*, Nos. 10-1491 and 11-88, --- S.Ct. ----, 79 USLW 3728 (2011), cert. granted October 17, 2011.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

Hon. Edward J. Davila
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiffs’ Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss is due November 18, 2011, while Defendants’ Reply is due January 16, 2012, with hearing scheduled for February 17, 2012.