1	CHRISTINA M DENNING ESO (CA	Rar No. 211137)
2	CHRISTINA M. DENNING, ESQ. (CA Bar No. 211137) denningc@higgslaw.com SCOTT J. INGOLD, ESQ. (NV Bar No. 11818)	
3	ingolds@higgslaw.com	11010)
4	Higgs Fletcher & Mack LLP	
5	401 West "A" Street, Suite 2600 San Diego, CA 92101-7913	
6	T: 619.236.1551	
7	F: 619.696.1410	
8	JAMES F. HOLTZ, ESQ. (NV Bar No.	8119)
	james.holtz@holtzapc.com LAW OFFICE OF JAMES F. HOLTZ	
9	1120 Town Center Drive, Suite 200	
10	Las Vegas, NV 89144	
11	T: 702.304.1803 F: 702.304.1822	
12		
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK HUNT	
14		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
17	MARK HUNT, an individual,	Case No.: 2:17-cv-00085-JAD-CWH
18	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND
19	v.	ORDER RE: EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO MOTION
20	ZUFFA, LLC d/b/a ULTIMATE	TO DISMISS (FIRST REQUEST)
21	FIGHTING CHAMPIONSHIP, a Nevada limited liability company;	ECF No. 80
22	BROCK LESNAR, an individual;	
23	DANA WHITE, an individual; and	
24	DOES 1-50, inclusive,	
25	Defendants.	
26	111	_
27		
28	111	
	1	

HIGGS FLETCHER & MACK LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE: EXTENSION TO FILE OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS Case No.: 2:17-ov-00085--JAD-CWH

Pursuant to Local Rules IA 6-1, 6-2, and LR 7-1, Plaintiff MARK HUNT ("Hunt"), and Defendants ZUFFA, LLC d/b/a ULTIMATE FIGHTING CHAMPIONSHIP ("Zuffa") and DANA WHITE ("White") hereby stipulate to extend the deadline for Hunt to file his Opposition to Zuffa and White's Motion to Dismiss [Doc. 71], filed June 26, 2017, from July 10, 2017 until July 17, 2017. This stipulation is based on the following:

Zuffa and White filed their Motion to Dismiss [Doc. 71] on June 26, 2017, following a stipulated extension of time for Zuffa and White to respond to Hunt's First Amended Complaint. Hunt's opposition is presently due July 10, 2017. Hunt, on one hand, and White and Zuffa, on the other, have agreed to extend the date for Hunt to file his opposition one week to July 17, 2017. Hunt submits that good cause exists to extend the date his opposition is due based on the fact that Hunt's lead counsel is out of the office due to a pre-planned vacation, and will not return until after the date Hunt's opposition is due. Hunt's secondary counsel recently returned from a pre-planned vacation, and will be in a deposition that was scheduled several weeks ago on the date the opposition is due. The one-week extension will ensure that Hunt is able to prepare a meaningful and adequate response to White and Zuffa's Motion to Dismiss. Moreover, no hearing date has been set for the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. This is the first stipulation seeking to extend the deadline for Hunt's opposition to Zuffa and White's Motion to Dismiss.

Based on the foregoing, the parties hereby stipulate and request that the Court issue an Order extending the deadline for Hunt to file an opposition to Zuffa and White's Motion to Dismiss until July 17, 2017.

```
///
```

///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

///

112567-00001

8046436.1

28

1	IT IS SO STIPULATED.	
2		
3	DATED: July 6, 2017	HIGGS FLETCHER & MACK LLP
4		/s/ Scott J. Ingold
5		By: CHRISTINA M. DENNING, ESQ.
6		SCOTT J. INGOLD, ESQ.
7		Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK HUNT
8	DATED 11 ( 2017	CAMPDELL O WHILLAMO
9	DATED: July 6, 2017	CAMPBELL & WILLIAMS
10		s/ J. Colby Williams By:
11		J. COLBY WILLIAMS, ESQ.
12		PHILIP R. ERWIN, ESQ. Attorneys for Defendants ZUFFA, LLC
13		d/b/a ULTIMATE FIGHTING
4.4		CHAMPIONSHIP and DANA WHITE
14		
		RDER
15	Ol	RDER
	Ol  Based on the stipulation between plai	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White
15 16	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White under LR 7-1(c), <b>IT IS SO ORDERED.</b>
15 16 17	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White
15 16 17 18	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White under LR 7-1(c), <b>IT IS SO ORDERED.</b>
15 16 17 18 19	Based on the stipulation between plai [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Based on the stipulation between plai [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Based on the stipulation between plain [ECF No. 80], which I treat as a joint motion	intiff and defendants Zuffa, LLC and Dana White a under LR 7-1(c), IT IS SO ORDERED.  U.S. District Judge Jenn fer Dorsey

112567-00001 8046436.1