

1 WILKE, FLEURY, HOFFELT, GOULD & BIRNEY, LLP  
2 THOMAS G. REDMON (SBN 047090)  
3 DANIEL L. BAXTER (SBN 203862)  
400 Capitol Mall, Twenty-Second Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814

4 Telephone: (916) 441-2430  
5 Facsimile: (916) 442-6664

6 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
7 ENU MAINIGI (to apply *pro hac vice*)  
8 JENNIFER G. WICHT (to apply *pro hac vice*)  
9 HOLLY M. CONLEY (to apply *pro hac vice*)  
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-5000  
Facsimile: (202) 434-5029

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 MEDCO HEALTH SOLUTIONS, INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 MICHAEL DESRYS, as an Individual and  
16 on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 MEDCO HEALTH SOLUTIONS, INC., a  
20 Delaware Corporation, FEDERICO  
21 BUENROSTRO, Individually, KURATO  
SHIMADA, Individually, CHARLES  
VALDES, Individually, and DOES 1-100,  
Inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 11-CV-01626-LKK-DAD

**STIPULATION AND ORDER  
CONTINUING INITIAL STATUS  
(PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)  
CONFERENCE**

Complaint Filed: March 17, 2011  
Date Removed: June 16, 2011  
Trial Date: Not Yet Set

23  
24 **RECITALS**

25 Currently on the Court's calendar for September 6, 2011 is the Initial Status (Pretrial  
26 Scheduling) Conference in this action. The pendency of that Conference means, among other  
27 things, that the parties face imminent deadlines relative to meeting and conferring and crafting a  
28 discovery plan in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f). In light of certain

1 recent occurrences in this action (described below), the parties wish to continue the September 6,  
2 2011 Conference to a date of the Court's choosing on or after November 14, 2011.

3 The parties have recently filed—and the Court has entered—a stipulation and order under  
4 which Plaintiff has twenty days to submit an amended complaint, and Defendants have thirty days  
5 thereafter to respond. (CM/ECF Doc. No. 15.) The parties would ideally like to have the case “at  
6 issue” before holding the Conference and complying with the various requirements attendant  
7 thereto. Continuance of the Conference to a date on or after November 14 will significantly  
8 increase the likelihood that the case will have achieved at-issue status, such that the parties can  
9 undertake their obligations under Rule 26 with the benefit of having the pleadings settled.

10 **STIPULATION**

11 In light of the above, the parties HEREBY STIPULATE AND AGREE that the Initial  
12 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference shall be continued from September 6, 2011 to a date of  
13 the Court's choosing on or after November 14, 2011.

14  
15 DATED: July 27, 2011

WILKE, FLEURY, HOFFELT,  
GOULD & BIRNEY, LLP

17 By:                   /s/Daniel L. Baxter                    
18 DANIEL L. BAXTER  
Attorneys for Defendant  
19 MEDCO HEALTH SOLUTIONS, INC.

20 DATED: July 27, 2011

HACKARD LAW, a Professional Corporation

22 By:                   /s/ Michael A. Hackard                    
MICHAEL A. HACKARD  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
23 MICHAEL DESRYS et al.

24 DATED: July 27, 2011

26 By:                   /s/ Charles Valdes                    
CHARLES VALDES  
27 Defendant

1           Given the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Initial Scheduling Conference,  
2 currently scheduled for September 6, 2011 is continued to November 14, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. in  
3 Courtroom 4. The parties shall file their status reports fourteen (14) days prior to the status  
4 conference.

5  
6 Dated: July 28, 2011

7  
8 

9 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
10 SENIOR JUDGE  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Teri Vargas, declare:

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Sacramento County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 400 Capitol Mall, Twenty-Second Floor, Sacramento, California 95814. On June 27, 2011, I served a copy of the within document(s):

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING INITIAL STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE**

- by transmitting via facsimile the document(s) listed above to the fax number(s) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m.
- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Sacramento, California addressed as set forth below.
- by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed \_\_\_\_\_ envelope and affixing a pre-paid air bill, and causing the envelope to be delivered to a \_\_\_\_\_ agent for delivery.
- by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

Charles Valdes  
4830 Kipling Drive  
Carmichael, CA 95608

Kurato Shimada  
8880 Wine Valley Circle  
San Jose, CA 95135

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

///

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  
27  
28

Executed on June 27, 2011, at Sacramento, California.

/s/ Teri Vargas  
Teri Vargas