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

telephone and other device users on whose devices software made by defendant Carrier IQ, Inc. is or has been embedded (collectively, including the above-captioned matter, the "CIQ cases");

WHEREAS, a motion is pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer the CIQ cases to this jurisdiction for coordinated and consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1407, responses to the motion supporting coordination or consolidation have been filed, and plaintiffs and defendants anticipate that additional responses will be filed:

WHEREAS plaintiffs anticipate the possibility of one or more consolidated amended complaints in the CIQ cases;

WHEREAS plaintiffs and defendant Carrier IQ have agreed that an orderly schedule for any response to the pleadings in the CIQ cases would be more efficient for the parties and for the Court;

WHEREAS plaintiffs agree that the deadline for defendant Carrier IQ to answer, move, or otherwise respond to their complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1) forty-five days after the filing of a consolidated amended complaint in the CIQ cases; or (2) fortyfive days after plaintiffs provide written notice to defendants that plaintiffs do not intend to file a consolidated amended complaint; or (3) as otherwise ordered by this Court or the MDL transferee court; provided, however, that in the event that Carrier IQ should agree to an earlier response date in any of these cases, Carrier IQ will respond to the complaint in the above-captioned action on that earlier date;

WHEREAS plaintiffs further agree that this extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiffs, to all named defendants who notify plaintiffs in writing of and the court their intention to join this Stipulation;

WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by Carrier IQ of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process or service of process;

WHEREAS, with respect to any defendant joining the Stipulation, this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process, or service of process; and

WHEREAS, plaintiffs and defendant Carrier IQ, as well as any defendant joining this Stipulation, agree that preservation of evidence in the CIQ cases is vital, that defendants have received litigation hold letters, that they are complying with and will continue to comply with all of their evidence preservation obligations under governing law, and that the delay brought about by this Stipulation should not result in the loss of any evidence,

Now, therefore, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12, plaintiffs in the above-referenced case and defendant Carrier IQ, by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

- 1. The deadline for Carrier IQ to answer, move, or otherwise respond to plaintiffs' complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: forty-five days after the filing of a consolidated amended complaint in these cases; or forty-five days after plaintiffs provide written notice to defendant Carrier IQ that plaintiffs do not intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint; or as otherwise ordered by this Court or the MDL transferee court; provided, however, that in the event that Carrier IQ should agree to an earlier response date in any of these cases, except by court order, Carrier IQ will respond to the complaint in the above-captioned case on that earlier date.
- 2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiffs, to all named defendants who notify plaintiffs in writing of their intention to join this Stipulation;
- 3. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by Carrier IQ or any other named defendant joining the Stipulation of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process, or service of process.
- 4. As a condition of entry into this Stipulation, defendant Carrier IQ and any other defendant(s) joining this Stipulation, and the plaintiffs, agree that they are complying with and will continue to comply with all evidentiary preservation obligations under governing law.

	1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
	2	DATED: December 29, 2011 KIESEL BOUCHER LARSON LLP
	3	By /s/ Paul R. Kiesel
	4	Paul R. Kiesel (119854) KIESEL BOUCHER LARSON LLP
	5	8648 Wilshire Boulevard
	6	Beverly Hills, CA 90211 Ph: (310) 854-4444
	7	Fax: (310) 854-0812 kiesel@kbla.com
	8	
	9	HORWITZ, HORWITZ & PARADIS 570 Seventh Avenue, 20 th Floor
	10	New York, NY 10018 Ph: (212) 986-4500
	11	Fax: (212) 986-4501
	12	Attorneys for Plaintiff
LLP	13	FENWICK & WEST LLP
FENWICK & WEST LLP Attorneys at Law Mountain View	14	By /s/ Tyler G. Newby
AWICK A	15	Tyler G. Newby (CSB No. 205790) tnewby@fenwick.com
FEN	16	Jennifer J. Johnson (CSB No. 252897)
		jjjohnson@fenwick.com 555 California Street, 12th Floor
	17	San Francisco, CA 94104 Ph: (415) 875-2300
	18	Fig. (415) 875-2500 Fax: (415) 281-1350
	19	Rodger R. Cole (CSB NO. 178865)
	20	rcole@fenwick.com Molly R. Melcher (CSB NO. 272950)
	21	mmelcher@fenwick.com
	22	Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street
	23	Mountain View, CA 94041 Ph: 650.988.8500
	24	Fax: 650.938.5200
	25	Attorneys for Defendant Carrier IQ, Inc.
	26	
	27	
	28	

	1	CERTIFICATION I, Tyler G. Newby, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE: CONTINUANCE OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT. In compliance with General		
FENWICK & WEST LLF ATTORNEYS AT LAW MOUNTAIN VIEW	2			
	3			
	4			
	5	Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that Paul R. K	Giesel has concurred in this filing.	
	6	DATED D. 1. 20 2011		
	7	DATED: December 29, 2011 E	By <u>/s/ Tyler G. Newby</u> TYLER G. NEWBY (CSB No. 205790)	
	8		FENWICK & WEST LLP 555 California Street, 12th Floor	
	9		San Francisco, CA 94104 Ph: (415) 875-2300	
	10		Fax: (415) 281-1350 tnewby@fenwick.com	
	11		the way early text.com	
	12			
	13	25143/00401/SF/5371770.1		
	14	25145/00401/51/55/1770.1		
	15			
	16			
	17			
	18			
	19			
	20			
	21			
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25			
	26			
	27			

28

FENWICK & WEST LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW MOUNTAIN VIEW	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	RODGER R. COLE (CSB No. 178865) rcole@fenwick.com MOLLY R. MELCHER (CSB No. 272950) mmelcher@fenwick.com FENWICK & WEST LLP Silicon Valley Center 801 California Street Mountain View, CA 94041 Telephone: 650.988.8500 Facsimile: 650.938.5200 TYLER G. NEWBY (CSB No. 205790) tnewby@fenwick.com JENNIFER J. JOHNSON (CSB No. 252897) ijjohnson@fenwick.com 555 California Street, 12 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: 415.875.2300 Facsimile: 415.281.1350 Attorneys for Defendant Carrier IQ, Inc. UNITED STATES DIS NORTHERN DISTRICT SAN JOSE DI	OF CALIFORNIA
	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	EDWARD SHUMATE, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. CARRIER IQ, a Delaware corporation, Defendant. Pursuant to stipulation, it is SO ORDERED. Dated: January 9, 2012	Case No.: CV-11-06281 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT Hon trable Edylard J. Davila United States District Judge Howard R. Lloyd
	28	[PROPOSED] ORDER	United States Magistrate Judge CV-11-06281