STIPULATION TO CONTINUE CERTAIN PRETRIAL DATES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pursuant to Rules 6-1(a) and 16-2(e) of the Local Rules of the Northern District of California, Plaintiffs Geoff Williamson and Ron Ballard (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and Defendants The Reinalt-Thomas Corporation and Discount Tire Co., Inc. (collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their attorneys of record, hereby stipulate to continue the following dates in this matter for the following reasons:

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their complaint in this matter on July 19, 2011, and in response Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(2), which motion is scheduled to be heard on February 2, 2012, and due to that pending motion, Defendants are concerned that any actions taken to litigate in this Court may affect their jurisdictional challenges or be perceived to waive those alleged defects;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion is due on October 14, 2011; WHEREAS, pursuant to Local Rule 16-8 and ADR Rule 3-5, the parties are required to complete an ADR Certification or Stipulation Selecting an ADR Process and the Clerk recently served a Notice of Non-Compliance with those ADR rules on October 3, 2011;

WHEREAS, the Court has set an Initial Case Management Conference for October 19. 2011, and the parties are required to meet and confer and then to file a Joint Case Management Conference Statement by October 12, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the parties also are required to comply with Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 26(f) and to make certain initial disclosures in this matter (with the exception of certain jurisdictional discovery which may be required in connection with Defendants' motion).

In light of Defendants' pending motion and their jurisdictional challenges, the parties request the Court to continue all pretrial dates in this matter until after that motion has been determined, as it is premature to devote time to these matters in light of Defendants' jurisdictional challenges and may adversely impact those claims.

This Stipulation is not for purpose of delay. Rather, for convenience of the parties and this court, and to promote efficiency, it makes sense to continue these pretrial dates until after the court's hearing of Defendants' motion to dismiss. The court's determination of

STIPULATION TO CONTINUE CERTAIN PRETRIAL DATES