

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BEHROUZ SHOKRI,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY, a Delaware  
Corporation,

Defendant.

No. C16-1132 RSM

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO STAY  
PROCEEDINGS REGARDING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR COSTS,  
DKT. 147

Plaintiff Behrouz Shokri (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant The Boeing Company (“Defendant”) (together, the “Parties”), by and through their counsel of record, hereby agree and stipulate to stay proceedings related to Defendant’s Motion for Costs, *Dkt.* 147, pending resolution of Plaintiff’s anticipated appeal of this Court’s April 25, 2018 decision granting Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment. In support, the Parties state as follows:

1. On April 25, 2018, this Court granted Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment.
2. On May 10, 2018, Defendant filed a Motion for Costs pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 54(d) and Local Civil Rule (“LCR”) 54(d).
3. Plaintiff intends to file an appeal of the District Court’s rulings.
4. The resolution of the anticipated appeal may affect issues related to Defendant’s Motion for Costs.

1           5.       Plaintiff agrees that if the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit  
2 (“Ninth Circuit”) affirms this Court’s order granting Defendant’s Motion for Summary  
3 Judgment, he will file any opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Costs within seven days of the  
4 issuance of the Ninth Circuit’s decision.

5  
6           THEREFORE, the Parties stipulate and agree as follows:

7           1.       All proceedings related to Defendant’s Motion for Costs (*Dkt.* 147), including  
8 all responsive briefing and resolution of the motion, is stayed pending resolution of Plaintiff’s  
9 anticipated appeal. If the Ninth Circuit affirms this Court’s order granting Defendant’s Motion  
10 for Summary Judgment, Plaintiff will file any opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Costs  
11 within seven days of the issuance of the Ninth Circuit’s decision.

1 STIPULATED to this 17<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018.

2  
3 Attorneys for Plaintiff:

4 By: s/ Scott C. G. Blankenship  
5 Scott C. G. Blankenship, WSBA No. 21431  
6 Richard E. Goldsworthy, WSBA No. 40684  
7 The Blankenship Law Firm, P.S.  
8 1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3250  
9 Seattle, WA 98104  
10 Telephone: (206) 343-2700  
11 Facsimile: (206) 343-2704  
12 sblankenship@blankenshiplawfirm.com  
13 rgoldsworthy@blankenshiplawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendant:

By: s/ Lincoln O. Bisbee  
Laurence A. Shapero, WSBA No. 31301  
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak  
& Stewart, P.C.  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Tel: (206) 876-5301  
Fax: (206) 693-7058  
laurence.shapero@ogletree.com

Clifford D. Sethness, WSBA No. 14110  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP  
300 South Grand Avenue, 22nd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 612-2500  
Facsimile: (213) 612-2501  
clifford.sethness@morganlewis.com

Lincoln O. Bisbee, Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*  
Morgan Lewis & Blockius LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001  
lincoln.bisbee@morganlewis.com

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED** this 18<sup>th</sup> day of May 2018.

22 

23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
24 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE