## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Du Daobin, et al.	) )
Plaintiff, v. CISCO Systems, Inc., et al.	) ) ) Civil Action No. 8:11-cv-01538 PJM ) ) ) ) ) )
Defendant.	
9	<u>ORDER</u>
UPON CONSIDERATION of the Pa	rties' Joint Motion For Extension Of Time To
Respond To The Complaint, it is by the Court this day of, 2011, ORDERED:	
<ol> <li>If this Court denies Defendants' requ shall respond to the Complaint within</li> </ol>	est for a stay (Docket No. 17), then the Defendants in 30 days of such Order;
	est for a stay in any respect, then the Defendants in 30 days of the expiration of such a stay;
3. Plaintiffs' brief in opposition to any motion to dismiss shall be due 30 days following the service of such motion by Defendants; and	
4. Defendants' reply brief in further sup following the service of such Opposit	oport of any motion to dismiss shall be due 21 days tion Brief by Plaintiffs.
SO ORDERED.	
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE