EXHIBIT D

Dockets.Justia.com

	Case5:10-cv-02389-JW Documente	68 Filed12/08/10 Page1 of 5		
1	COOLEY LLP	MICHAEL J. ASCHENBRENER (pro hac		
2	MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@cooley.com) MATTHEW D. BROWN (196972)	vice) (maschenbrener@edelson.com) BENJAMIN H. RICHMAN (pro hace vice) (brichman@edelson.com)		
3	(brownmd@cooley.com) JAMES M. PENNING (229727)	350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300 Chicago, Illinois 60654		
4	(jpenning@cooley.com) 101 California Street, 5th Floor	Telephone: (312) 589-6370 Facsimile: (312) 589-6378		
5	San Francisco, CA 94111-5800 Telephone: (415) 693-2000	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
6	Facsimile: (415) 693-2222			
7	Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.			
8 9	NASSIRI & JUNG LLP KASSRA P. NASSIRI (215405)			
10	(knassiri@nassiri-jung.com) CHARLES H. JUNG (217909)			
11	(cjung@nassiri-jung.com) 251 Kearny Street, Suite 501			
12	San Francisco, CA 94108 Telephone: (415) 762-3100 Facsimile: (415) 534-3200			
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
14				
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
16	NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17	SAN JO	DSE DIVISION		
18	IN RE: FACEBOOK PRIVACY LITIGATION	Case No. 10-cv-02389-JW		
19		STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO		
20		COMPLAINT (L.R. 6-2)		
21		Courtroom: 8 Judge: James Ware		
22		Trial Date: None Set		
23	This Stimulation is entered into by an	d among plaintiffs David Gould and Mike Robertson		
24	This Stipulation is entered into by and among plaintiffs David Gould and Mike Robertson			
25	(collectively, "Plaintiffs") and defendant Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook") (Plaintiffs and Facebook			
26	collectively "the Parties"), by and through their respective counsel.			
27	WHEREAS, the complaint in <i>Gould v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , Case No. 10-cv-02389-JW (" <i>Gould</i> ") was filed on May 28, 2010;			
28	(<i>Soura</i>) was filed off fylay 20, 2010,			
AW D		1. STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT, CASE NO. 10-CV-02389 JW		

	Case5:10-cv-02389-JW Document68 Filed12/08/10 Page2 of 5	
1	WHEREAS, the complaint in Robertson v. Facebook, Inc., Case No. 10-cv-02408-JF	
2	("Robertson") was filed on June 1, 2010;	
3	WHEREAS, this Court (Hon James Ware), by Order of July 26, 2010, related Gould and	
4	Robertson;	
5	WHEREAS, by Order of August 20, 2010, the Court consolidated Gould and Robertson	
6	and ordered the new caption to be In re Facebook Privacy Litigation, Case No. 10-cv-02389-JW	
7	(and ordered Case No. 10-cv-02408-JW to be closed); ¹	
8	WHEREAS, the Plaintiffs filed their Consolidated Class Action Complaint in the above-	
9	captioned action on October 10, 2010;	
10	WHEREAS, on November 5, 2010, the Court entered an Order extending from November	
11	10, 2010 to December 10, 2010 as the deadline for Facebook to answer, move to dismiss, or	
12	otherwise respond to the Consolidated Class Action Complaint in the above-captioned litigation;	
13	WHEREAS, by Orders dated November 12 and 19, 2010, this Court granted	
14	administrative motions relating several other cases against Facebook, Zynga, or both to the	
15	above-captioned action (In re Facebook Privacy Litigation);	
16	WHEREAS, in the November 12 and 19, 2010 Orders, this Court invited the parties in the	
17	related cases to fully brief, by November 22, 2010, the issue of whether the related cases should	
18	be consolidated and the issue of who should be appointed Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel;	
19	WHEREAS, parties in the related cases filed briefing on November 22, 2010;	
20	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs the above-captioned action filed briefing opposing consolidation	
21	and seeking renewal of their appointment as Co-Lead Counsel and Co-Lead Plaintiff on	
22	November 22, 2010;	
23	WHEREAS, this Court has not yet issued a decision on consolidation and appointment of	
24	Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel;	
25		
26	¹ While efforts were undertaken to get the actions related and then consolidated, the Parties	
27	stipulated to extensions of Facebook's deadline to respond to the complaints. Orders granting	
28	extensions pursuant to these stipulations were entered on June 14, July 27, and August 11 <i>Robertson</i> , and on June 24, July 27, and August 11 in <i>Gould</i> .	

Case5:10-cv-02389-JW Document68 Filed12/08/10 Page3 of 5

1	WHEREAS, under Civil Local Rule 6-2, j	parties may file a stipulation requesting an order	
2	extending the time within which to answer, n	nove to dismiss, or otherwise respond to the	
3	Complaint; and		
4	WHEREAS, extending the date for Face	book to answer, move to dismiss, or otherwise	
5	respond to the Complaint as set forth below w	ill not alter the date of any event or deadline	
6	already fixed by Court order;		
7	7 NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:		
8	1. Facebook's deadline to respond t	to the Complaint (answer, move, or otherwise	
9	9 respond) is extended to and including the later of (a) December 22, 2010 or (b) 30 days after		
10 Court decides whether an amended complaint shall be filed.			
11	2. If the Court orders an amended co	omplaint to be filed, Facebook is relieved of the	
12	obligation of responding to the current Consolidation	ated Class Action Complaint, and shall have 30	
13	days following filing of the amended complaint to respond (answer, move, or otherwise respond),		
14	14 unless a different date is ordered by the Court.		
15 3. Facebook agrees to confer with Plaintiffs on a briefing and hearing		Plaintiffs on a briefing and hearing schedule	
16	6 before filing any motion in response to the operative complaint.		
17			
18	18 IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
19	Dated: December 8, 2010 CO	OLEY LLP	
20			
21	Mat	Matthew D. Brown tthew D. Brown	
22	Atto	orneys for Defendant Facebook, Inc.	
23	Dated: December 8, 2010 ED	ELSON MCGUIRE LLC	
24	/s/	Michael J. Aschenbrener	
25	Mi	chael J. Aschenbrener (pro hac vice) corneys for Plaintiffs	
26	Au		
27			
28 Cooley LLP Attorneys At Law San Francisco	3.	STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO Respond To Complaint, Case No. 10-cv-02389 JW	

	Case5:10-cv-02389-JW Document68 Filed12/08/10 Page4 of 5	
1	Dated: December 8, 2010 NASSIRI & JUNG LLP	
2	/s/ Kassra P. Nassiri	
3	Kassra P. Nassiri Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
4		
5		
6	<u>[PROPOSED] ORDER</u> PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
7	TURSUANT TO STILULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8	Dated: December, 2010	
9	THE HONORABLE JAMES WARE United States District Judge	
10	Office States District Judge	
11		
12 13		
13		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28 Cooley LLP		
COOLEY ELP ITORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO	4. STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT, CASE NO. 10-CV-02389 JW	

	Case5:10-cv-02389-JW Document68 Filed12/08/10 Page5 of 5
1	FILER'S ATTESTATION
2	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X, Subparagraph B, the undersigned attests that
3	all parties have concurred in the filing of this Stipulation to Extend Time to Respond to
4	Complaint (L.R. 6-1(a)).
5	
6	Dated: December 8, 2010 /s/ Matthew D. Brown
7	Matthew D. Brown
8	901609 v2/HN
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28 P	
LAW CO	5. STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT, CASE NO. 10-CV-02389 JW