oyal Oak	Retirement System v. Juniper Networks, Inc. et al	Do	C.
1			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
8	NORTHERN DISTR	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9 10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10	OLGA RATINOVA, derivatively on behalf of	) Case No.: 11-CV-04792-LHK	
11	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.	<ul> <li>Related Case No.: 11-CV-04003-LHK</li> <li>Related Case No.: 11-CV-06667-LHK</li> </ul>	
12	Plaintiff, v.	) )	
13		) ORDER SUGGESTING STIPULATION	
14	KEVIN JOHNSON et al.,	<ul><li>) OF DISMISSAL OR REQUIRING JOINT</li><li>) STATUS REPORT IN CONSOLIDATED</li></ul>	
15	Defendants.	) DERIVATIVE ACTIONS	
17		) )	
18	LISA E. COPPOLA, IRA, derivatively on behalf of JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.	) )	
19	Plaintiff,	ý )	
20	v.	) )	
20	KEVIN JOHNSON, et al.,	)	
22	Defendants.	)	
23	and	)	
24	JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC.,	)	
25	Nominal Defendant.	)	
26		)	
27		1	
28	Case No.: 11-CV-04792-LHK Related Case No.: 11-CV-04003-LHK Related Case No.: 11-CV-06667-LHK		
	ORDER SUGGESTING STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL CONSOLIDATED DERIVATIVE ACTIONS	OR REQUIRING JOINT STATUS REPORT IN	
		Dockets.Justi	a.

Dockets.Justia.com

**United States District Court** For the Northern District of California

CITY OF ROYAL OAK RETIREMENT SYSTEM, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	
JUNIPER NETWORKS, INC., KEVIN R. JOHNSON, ROBYN M. DENHOLM, and SCOTT G. KRIENS,	
Defendants.	

On February 6, 2012, the Court granted the parties' stipulation to stay proceedings in this action until an order was entered by the Court denying the motion to dismiss in the related class action, City of Royal Oak Retirement System v. Juniper Networks, Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-04003-LHK (the "Class Action"). See ECF No. 43. If the motion to dismiss were denied, the parties stipulated that Plaintiffs would have thirty days to file an amended complaint. Id.

On July 23, 2012, the Court granted Juniper's Motion to Dismiss without prejudice, and granted Kriens's Motion to Dismiss without prejudice. See Class Action, ECF No. 84. On May 17, 2013, the Court granted Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint in the Class Action, though this time with prejudice. See Class Action, ECF No. 105.

Accordingly, by July 12, 2013, the parties in Ratinova v. Johnson et al, Case No.: 11-CV-04792-LHK, as well as Coppola v. Juniper Networks, Inc. et al, Case No. 11-CV-06667-LHK, shall either file a Stipulation of Dismissal or a Joint Status Report in which the parties set forth good cause why the case shall not be dismissed.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 8, 2013

ucy H. Koh

LUCY HCOH United States District Judge

27 Case No.: 11-CV-04792-LHK
28 Related Case No.: 11-CV-04003-LHK
Related Case No.: 11-CV-06667-LHK

ORDER SUGGESTING STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OR REQUIRING JOINT STATUS REPORT IN CONSOLIDATED DERIVATIVE ACTIONS