


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

----- X
PASHA ANWAR, et al.,)
))
Plaintiffs,)
))
v.)
))
FAIRFIELD GREENWICH LIMITED, et al.,)
))
Defendants.)
))
This Document Relates To: *Bhatia v. Standard Chartered*)
International (USA) Ltd., No. 09-CV-2410; *Tradewaves*)
Ltd. v. Standard Chartered International (USA) Ltd., No.)
09-CV-9423; *Headway Investment Corp. v. American*)
Express Bank Ltd., No. 09-CV-08500; *Ricardo Lopez v.*)
Standard Chartered Bank International (Americas) Ltd.,)
No. 10-CV-00919; *Maridom Ltd. v. Standard Chartered*)
Bank International (Americas) Ltd., No. 10-CV-00920;)
and *Maria Akriby Valladolid v. American Express Bank*)
Ltd., No. 10-CV-00918.)
----- X

Master File No. 09-CV-118 (VM)



UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CORRECT THE REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER

On April 7, 2010, plaintiffs filed an “unopposed” motion for an enlargement of time to respond to the Standard Chartered Defendants’¹ motions to dismiss their complaints.² Pursuant to that motion, plaintiffs’ time to respond would be enlarged from April 26, 2010 to May 3, 2010. The Court endorsed plaintiffs’ motion on April 9, 2010.

¹ The “Standard Chartered Defendants” include Standard Chartered Bank, Standard Chartered International (USA) Ltd., and Standard Chartered Bank International (Americas) Ltd., as defined in the Initial Scheduling Order that was entered by the Court on January 29, 2010.

² On that same date, plaintiffs subsequently filed a modified motion in order to include a date certain for Standard Chartered Defendants’ reply. This motion has not yet been endorsed by the Court and is moot in light of the instant motion.

Standard Chartered Defendants did not oppose that motion so long as their time to reply was not truncated in the process; in other words, Standard Chartered Defendant's time to reply would be extended so that it would still have as many days as under the original scheduling order. Unfortunately, in making their motion, plaintiffs, in fact significantly shortened Standard Chartered Defendants' time to reply to plaintiffs' opposition papers. Counsel has represented that this was wholly inadvertent.

Pursuant to the Initial Scheduling Order, entered by the Court on January 29, 2010, the Standard Chartered Defendants were to have 30 days to reply to plaintiffs' opposition papers. (Initial Scheduling Order ¶ 4.) Pursuant to the Order entered by the Court on April 9, 2010, adopting the schedule prepared by plaintiffs that was filed on April 7, 2010, Standard Chartered Defendants now have 21 days to reply to plaintiffs' opposition papers. (Order Extending Time to File Opposition at 3.) Standard Chartered Defendants hereby request, and plaintiffs do not oppose, that the Court correct this error and enter the following schedule, which schedule is unopposed:

Plaintiffs' Opposition Papers due: May 3, 2010

Standard Chartered Defendants' Reply Papers due: June 4, 2010

Dated: April 12, 2010
New York, New York


/s/ Sharon L. Nelles

Sharon L. Nelles (SN-3144)
Bradley P. Smith (BS-1383)
Patrick B. Berarducci (PB-2222)
SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
125 Broad Street
New York, New York 10004
Telephone: (212) 558-4000
Facsimile: (212) 558-3588
nelless@sullcrom.com

Diane L. McGimsey
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
1888 Century Park East
Los Angeles, California 90067

*Attorneys for Defendants Standard
Chartered Bank International
(Americas) Ltd., Standard Chartered
International (USA) Ltd., Standard
Chartered Bank and Standard
Chartered PLC*

SO ORDERED:



U.S.D.J. USMV

April 16, 2010