1	KEITH R. VERGES (kverges@figdav.com)	
2	PARKER D. YOUNG (parker.young@figday RAYMOND E. WALKER (ray.walker@figday)	
3	FIGARI & DAVENPORT, L.L.P.	
4	901 Main Street, Suite 3400 Dallas, Texas 75202	
5	Tel: (214) 939-2000	
	Fax: (214) 939-2090 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)	
6	SHAWN T. LEUTHOLD	VERA BROOKS
7	(leuthold@aol.com)	(vbrooks@thompsonbrookslaw.com)
8	LAW OFFICE OF SHAWN T. LEUTHOLD 1671 The Alameda #303	THOMPSON & BROOKS 412 E. Madison Street, Suite 900
9	San Jose, California 95126	Tampa, Florida 33602
10	Tel: (408) 924-0132 Fax: (408) 924-0134	Tel: (813) 387-1822 Fax: (813) 387-1824
		(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
11 12	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF RICHARD NOLL	
13	IN THE LINITED S'	TATES DISTRICT COURT
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
16	RICHARD NOLL, Individually and on)
17	behalf of all others similarly situated,) CASE NO. 5:11-CV-04585-EJD
18	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [RRØRØSEX]
19	v.	ORDER REGARDING DISMISSAL OFRELATED CASE
20)
21	EBAY INC.,	 Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila Courtroom: 4, 5th Floor
	Defendant.) Trial Date: Not yet set
22)
23	This Stipulation is entered into purs	uant to Local Rule 7-12, by and between Plaintiffs
24	Richard Noll ("Noll") and Rhythm Motor	Sports, LLC ("Rhythm") and Defendant eBay Inc.
25	("eBay") (collectively, the "Parties"), by and	through the respective undersigned counsel.
26		
27		
28		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING CASE NO. 5:11-CV-04585-EJD	DISMISSAL OF RELATED CASE PAGE 1

WHEREAS, on July 10, 2012, Rhythm filed its Notice of Motion and Motion to Intervene, for Joinder and/or for Substitution *Pro Tanto* ("Motion to Intervene") [Doc. No. 69] and simultaneously filed a separate lawsuit against eBay styled Rhythm Motor Sports, LLC v. eBay Inc., Cause No. CV12-03601 PJH, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (the "Separate Rhythm Lawsuit");

WHEREAS, on September 4, 2012, the Court entered an Order [Doc. No. 83] granting the Motion to Intervene;

WHEREAS, on September 18, 2012, Rhythm filed its Original Class Action Complaint in Intervention herein asserting the same claims that Rhythm has asserted in the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit;

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that, for purposes of judicial economy and efficiency, Rhythm's claims should be litigated in this Action, rather than the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit;

WHEREAS, although the Parties disagree as to whether Rhythm's claims and the claims of the class it proposes to represent relate back to a date prior to July 10, 2012, for purposes of the applicable statutes of limitations, the Parties nevertheless agree that all applicable statutes of limitations governing such claims were fully and properly tolled as of the filing of the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit on July 10, 2012;

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that if Rhythm voluntarily dismisses the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit, Rhythm's ability to pursue its claims in this case should be the same as if it were asserting those claims within the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit and that the statutes of limitations governing Rhythm's claims and the claims of the class asserted herein should therefore be deemed to have been tolled effective no later than July 10, 2012;

28

WHEREAS, in order to facilitate the dismissal of the Separate Rhythm Lawsuit, the Parties wish to set forth their agreement regarding the applicability of any statute of limitations defenses to Rhythm's claims:

NOW THEREFORE, for purposes of any statute of limitations defense that may be asserted with respect to the claims asserted by Rhythm or the class it proposes to represent herein, the Parties agree and request that the Court enter an order that the running of any applicable statute of limitations shall be considered tolled as of no later than July 10, 2012. This stipulation is without prejudice to the Parties' respective positions regarding whether the statutes of limitations governing Rhythm's claims were tolled prior to July 10, 2012, or whether the assertion of Rhythm's claims relates back to a date prior to July 10, 2012, and the Parties expressly reserve their rights regarding such issues. Any issues regarding the tolling of limitations or the relation back of Rhythm's claims prior to July 10, 2012, shall be subsequently presented to the Court by the Parties when such a determination becomes necessary and appropriate.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: September 20, 2012. FIGARI & DAVENPORT, LLP

/s/ Keith R. Verges

Keith R. Verges

Attorneys for Plaintiff RICHARD NOLL

Dated: September 20, 2012. COOLEY LLP

/s/ Whitty Somvichian

Whitty Somvichian

Attorneys for Defendant EBAY INC.

1	Additional attorneys:
2	FIGARI & DAVENPORT, L.L.P.
3	Parker D. Young (parker.young@figdav.com) Raymond E. Walker (ray.walker@figdav.com)
4	901 Main Street, Suite 3400
5	Dallas, Texas 75202 Tel: (214) 939-2000
6	Fax: (214) 939-2090 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
7	Law Office of Shawn T. Leuthold
8	Shawn T. Leuthold (leuthold@aol.com)
9	1671 The Alameda #303 San Jose, California 95126
10	Telephone: (408) 924-0132 Facsimile: (408) 924-0134
11	1 acsimic. (400) 724-0134
12	THOMPSON & BROOKS Vara Brooks (whroaks@thompsonbrookslow.com)
13	Vera Brooks (vbrooks@thompsonbrookslaw.com) 412 E. Madison Street, Suite 900
14	Tampa, Florida 33602 Telephone: (813) 387-1822
15	Facsimile: (813) 387-1824 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
16	
17	
18	
19	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION IT IS SO ORDERED:
	$- \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ$
20	Dated: 9/24/2012 EQU QUAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING DISMISSAL OF RELATED CASE PAGE 4
	CASE NO. 5:11-CV-04585-EJD

1	FILER'S ATTESTATION:
2	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, 5X(B) regarding signatures, I attest under penalty of
3	perjury that the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from its signatories.
4	/s/ Keith R. Verges
5	Keith R. Verges Attorneys for Plaintiffs RICHARD NOLL and
6	RHYTHM MOTOR SPORTS LLC
7	
8	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
9	I hereby certify that all counsel of record will be served with a copy of this document via
10	the Court's CM/ECF system pursuant to the local rules of this Court on this 20 th day of
11	
12	September, 2012.
13	/s/ Keith R. Verges Keith R. Verges
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs RICHARD NOLL and
15	RHYTHM MOTOR SPORTS, LLC
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING DISMISSAL OF RELATED CASE CASE NO. 5:11-CV-04585-EJD

PAGE 5