## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

LIMITNONE LLC,	) Casa Na 08 ay 04	170
Plaintiff,	) Case No. 08-cv-04	1/8
VS.	) ) 	Mannin a
GOOGLE INC.,	) Hon. Blanche M. I	vianning
Defendant.	)	

## DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC.'S MOTION TO EXTEND THE RESPONSIVE PLEADING DEADLINE

Defendant Google Inc. ("Google"), by and through its attorneys, hereby moves this Honorable Court to extend Google's deadline for responding to LimitNone, LLC's ("LimitNone") Complaint to twenty (20) days after service of the docketing notice by the clerk for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. In support of its Motion, Google states as follows:

- 1. On September 22, 2008, the Court granted Google's Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, to Transfer Venue, ordering that this action be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California pursuant to Northern District of Illinois Local Rule 83.4. (Docket No. 45).
- 2. In light of the potential uncertainty surrounding the exact date upon which this action will be transferred to and docketed in the Northern District of California, on September 26, 2008 Google attempted to obtain a stipulation with LimitNone to set a date certain upon which Google's responsive pleading would be due. That same day, Google's counsel sent LimitNone's counsel a draft stipulation for review and signature.
- 3. On September 29, 2008 LimitNone's counsel informed Google that if this Court elected "not [to] stay the transfer, then we can enter the stipulation as we are fine with the concept." Nevertheless, despite several follow-up communications from Google's counsel, LimitNone's counsel has declined to execute and return Google's draft stipulation.

22242/2654198.2

4. Google has made no previous application for similar relief, and Google submits that this Motion is not made for purposes of delay or to otherwise prejudice LimitNone's claims. Rather, this Motion is made to settle any uncertainty that may exist as to pleading deadlines, in light of the imminent transfer of this action. LimitNone's counsel has expressed no opposition to Google's request.

WHEREFORE, for the forgoing reasons, Defendant Google respectfully requests that the Court enter an order setting Google's deadline to file and serve its response to LimitNone's Complaint for twenty (20) days after service of the docketing notice by the clerk for the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

DATED: October 2, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

GOOGLE INC.

By: /s/ Rachel M. Herrick
One of Its Attorneys

Michael T. Zeller (ARDC No. 6226433) QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017 (213) 443-3000 (213) 443-3100 (fax)

Rachel M. Herrick (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 560 Redwood Shores, California 94065 (650) 801-5000 (650) 801-5100 (fax)

Jonathan M. Cyrluk (ARDC No. 6210250) STETLER & DUFFY, LTD 11 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1200 Chicago, Illinois 60603 (312) 338-0200 (312) 338-0070 (fax)

Attorneys for Google Inc.

22242/2654198.2

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Rachel M. Herrick, an attorney, certify under penalty of perjury that I caused a copy of the forgoing document to be served on all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF online filing system this 2nd day of October, 2008.

/s/ Rachel M. Herrick
Rachel M. Herrick

22242/2654198.2