

1 **MICHAEL N. FEUER**, City Attorney – SBN 111529
 2 **KATHLEEN A. KENEALY**, Chief Assistant City Attorney – SBN 212289
 3 **JAMES P. CLARK**, Chief Deputy City Attorney – SBN 64780
 4 **SCOTT MARCUS**, Civil Litigation Branch Chief – SBN 184980
 5 **BLITHE S. BOCK**, Assistant City Attorney – SBN 163567
 6 **BENJAMIN F. CHAPMAN**, Deputy City Attorney – SBN 234436
 7 **JONATHAN H. EISENMAN**, Deputy City Attorney – SBN 279291
 200 North Main Street, 6th Floor, City Hall East
 8 Los Angeles, CA 90012
 Phone No.: (213) 978-7098 Fax No.: (213) 978-7011
 Email: benjamin.chapman@lacity.org

9 Attorneys for Defendant,
 10 CITY OF LOS ANGELES

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

14	ADAM BRANDY, et al.,)	CASE NO: CV20-02874-AB (SK)
15)	
16	Plaintiffs,)	STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO
17	vs.)	RESPOND TO INITIAL COMPLAINT (L.R.
18	ALEX VILLANUEVA, et al.,)	7-1)
19	Defendants.)	Complaint Served: April 1, 2020
20)	Current Response Date: May 25, 2020
21)	Proposed Response Date: June 24, 2020
22)	
23)	
24)	
25)	
26)	

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-1, Plaintiffs and the City of Los Angeles (the “City”),
2 through their attorneys of record, enter into the following stipulation to extend the time
3 for the City to respond to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint to June 24, 2020:

4 Whereas, the City was served with the summons and First Amended Complaint on
5 April 1, 2020;

6 Whereas, the First Amended Complaint is the initial complaint as to the City since
7 it added the City as a defendant for the first time;

8 Whereas, the parties previously stipulated to extend the time for the City to respond
9 to the First Amended Complaint to May 25, 2020 because Plaintiffs intended to seek leave
10 to file a Second Amended Complaint, making it a waste of party and judicial resources for
11 the City to respond to a complaint that would later be mooted (ECF No. 35);

12 Whereas, the Court signed an order extending the time for the City to respond to
13 the First Amended Complaint to May 25 (ECF No. 37);

14 Whereas, Plaintiffs have advised the City’s counsel that they still intend to seek
15 leave to amend the First Amended Complaint, but are also in active settlement discussions
16 with some of the other defendants which may obviate their inclusion, and thus have not
17 yet finalized the preparation of their proposed Second Amended Complaint;

18 Whereas, the parties do not believe that the City will have to file a responsive
19 pleading to the First Amended Complaint because Plaintiffs desire to seek leave to file a
20 Second Amended Complaint;

21 Whereas, the City will not oppose Plaintiffs’ request for leave to file a Second
22 Amended Complaint provided it is made on or before June 5, 2020;

23 Whereas, the City agrees that absent exigent circumstances, it will seek no further
24 extensions to respond to the First Amended Complaint;

25 NOW THEREFORE, for judicial economy, the parties stipulate that the City shall
26 have until June 24 to respond to the First Amended Complaint. Accordingly, the parties
27 respectfully request that the Court adopt the proposed order granting the stipulation
28 described herein.

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

Dated: May 21, 2020

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY OF LOS ANGELES

By:

/s/ Benjamin Chapman

Benjamin Chapman

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY OF LOS ANGELES

Dated: May 21, 2020

SEILER EPSTEIN LLP

By:

/s/ George M. Lee

George M. Lee

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i), all signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing’s content and have authorized the filing.