

1 EDWARD D. JOHNSON (SBN 189475)
 wjohnson@mayerbrown.com
 2 ERIC B. EVANS (SBN 232476)
 eevans@mayerbrown.com
 3 JONATHAN A. HELFGOTT (SBN 278969)
 jhelfgott@mayerbrown.com
 4 MAYER BROWN LLP
 Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 300
 5 3000 El Camino Real
 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112
 6 Telephone: (650) 331-2000
 Facsimile: (650) 331-2060
 7

8 Attorneys for Defendant
 Google Inc.
 9

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 11 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 12 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

12 RACHEL FREZZA and MAURO
 13 RODRIGUEZ, on their own behalf and all
 others similarly situated,
 14 Plaintiffs,
 v.
 15 GOOGLE INC.,
 Defendant.
 16

CASE NO. 5:12-CV-00237-RMW
**STIPULATED REQUEST FOR ORDER
 CHANGING TIME**
 Judge: Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
 Initial Complaint Filed: January 13, 2012

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil Local Rule 6-1(b) and 6-2(a), this stipulated request is entered
2 into between Counsel for Plaintiffs Rachel Frezza and Mauro Rodriguez (collectively
3 “Plaintiffs”) and Defendant Google Inc. (“Google”).

4 WHEREAS, Google served its Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint on
5 January 28, 2013 (Dkt. 37);

7 WHEREAS, the parties agreed that the hearing on Google’s Motion to Dismiss would
8 take place on March 15, 2013;

9 WHEREAS, when Google filed its Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint, a
10 briefing schedule was automatically set that contradicted the parties’ previously agreed-upon
11 briefing schedule (Dkt. 33);

12 WHEREAS, under the parties’ previously agreed-upon briefing schedule (Dkt 33),
13 Plaintiffs’ Response is not due until February 27, 2013 and Google’s Reply would not be due
14 until Wednesday, March 20, 2013; and

15 WHEREAS, under the agreed-upon briefing schedule, Google’s Reply is not due until
16 after the noticed hearing date;

17
18 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED that the parties jointly request that the
19 hearing on Google’s Motion to Dismiss be adjourned until April 19, 2013 at 9:00 a.m, or a later
20 date at the Court’s convenience, and that the briefing schedule reflected in Docket No. 33 be
21 recognized as controlling.
22

23 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2(a)(2), the parties state that on February 2, 2012,
24 Plaintiffs agreed to extend Google’s time to respond to the Complaint to March 16, 2012; on
25 March 30, 2012, the parties agreed to extend Plaintiffs’ time to file their Opposition to Google’s
26 Motion to Dismiss until April 20, 2012, and Google’s time to file its Reply until May 4, 2012; on
27 May 10, 2012, the parties stipulated and requested that the hearing on Google’s motion to
28

1 dismiss the complaint would be adjourned until June 15, 2012; on August 20, 2012, the parties
2 agreed that any case management conference would be adjourned until after the Court ruled on
3 Google's Motion to Dismiss; on December 13, 2012, the parties stipulated to enlarge Google's
4 time to respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint to January 22, 2013, and agreed that if
5 Google's Response to the First Amended Complaint were not an answer, but rather a motion
6 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12, then (i) Plaintiffs' opposition to that motion would be filed no
7 later than thirty (30) days from the date of service of that motion; and (ii) Google's reply would
8 be filed no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of service of Plaintiffs' opposition; and
9 on December 20, 2013, the parties stipulated that (i) Plaintiffs would have until and including
10 December 27, 2012 to file the First Amended Complaint, (ii) Google would have until and
11 including January 28, 2013 to respond to the First Amended Complaint; and (iii) in the event that
12 Google's response was a motion pursuant to Rule 12, Plaintiff's opposition to that motion would
13 be filed no later than thirty (30) days from the date of service of that motion, and Google's reply
14 would be filed no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of service of Plaintiffs'
15 opposition.
16
17

18 **IT IS SO STIPULATED AND REQUESTED**

19 DATED: February 13, 2012

MAYER BROWN LLP

21 By: s/ Edward D. Johnson

22 Edward D. Johnson (SBN 189475)
23 Eric B. Evans (SBN 232476)
24 Jonathan A. Helfgott (SBN 278969)

*Attorneys for Defendant
Google Inc.*

25 DATED: February 13, 2012

SIPRUT PC

27 By: /s/ Joseph J. Siprut

28 Joseph J. Siprut (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Todd C. Atkins (SBN 208879)

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

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Rachel
Frezza and Mauro Rodriguez*

Filer's attestation: In compliance with General Order 45(x)(B), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this Stipulation has been obtained from counsel for Plaintiff, Joseph J. Siprut.

/s/ Edward D. Johnson
Edward D. Johnson

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

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED THAT:

1. The hearing on Google’s Motion to Dismiss shall be adjourned to April 19, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.
2. Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Google’s Motion to Dismiss shall be filed no later than February 27, 2013, and Google’s Reply shall be filed no later than twenty-one days from the date of service of Plaintiffs’ Opposition.

DATED: February 14, 2013


HON. RONALD M. WHYTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE