

John V. Picone III, Bar No. 187226
 jpicone@hopkinscarley.com
 Jeffrey M. Ratinoff, Bar No. 197241
 jratinoff@hopkinscarley.com

HOPKINS & CARLEY
 A Law Corporation
 The Letitia Building
 70 South First Street
 San Jose, CA 95113-2406
mailing address:

P.O. Box 1469
 San Jose, CA 95109-1469
 Telephone: (408) 286-9800
 Facsimile: (408) 998-4790

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants
 NEO4J, INC. and NEO4J SWEDEN AB

Adron W. Beene, Bar No. 129040
 adron@adronlaw.com
 Adron G. Beene SB# 298088
 adronjr@adronlaw.com
 Attorney at Law
 1754 Technology Drive, Suite 228
 San Jose, CA 95110
 Tel: (408) 392-9233
 Fax: (866) 329-0453

Attorneys for Defendants and Counterclaimants
 PURETHINK LLC, IGOV INC., and JOHN
 MARK SUHY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NEO4J, INC., a Delaware corporation,
 NEO4J SWEDEN, AB,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PURETHINK LLC, a Delaware limited
 liability company, IGOV INC., a Virginia
 corporation, and JOHN MARK SUHY, an
 individual,

Defendants.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.

CASE NO. 5:18-cv-07182-EJD

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
 ORDER FOR MODIFICATION OF CASE
 SCHEDULE**

STIPULATION

This Stipulation is made between Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendants Neo4j, Inc. and Neo4j Sweden AB (collectively “Plaintiffs”) and Defendants and Counterclaimants PureThink LLC, iGov Inc. and John Mark Suhy (collectively, “Defendants”) through their respective attorneys. Plaintiffs and Defendants (collectively, the “Parties”) hereby stipulate to modify the current case schedule for the above-entitled action for good cause showing as follows:

1. On April 10, 2020, the Court granted the Parties’ stipulation concerning bifurcating the case into two phases. Dkt. Nos. 66, 68. Phase 1 was to adjudicate Plaintiffs’ claims pursuant to the Lanham Act and California’s unfair competition law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (“UCL”) and Defendants’ counterclaims and related defenses (excluding their unclean hands defense). *See* Dkt. No. 68, ¶ 3.

2. The Court also permitted the parties to depart from its one summary judgment motion rule by allowing them file a motion at the conclusion of Phase 1 and a motion during Phase 2. *See* Dkt. Nos. 66 and 68, ¶ 5 and ¶ 7.

3. On the parties’ respective Phase 1 summary judgment motions, the Court found in favor of Plaintiffs on all issues of liability pertaining to Plaintiffs’ Lanham Act and UCL claims. Dkt. No. 118. Defendants appealed the Court’s issuance of a preliminary injunction in conjunction with the granting of partial summary judgment on Plaintiffs’ Lanham Act and UCL claims. *See* Dkt. No. 121. The Ninth Circuit upheld this Court’s decision on February 18, 2022, and denied Defendants’ petition for rehearing on March 14, 2022. Dkt. 140-142. Thus, the only remaining issue to be decided in relation to Phase 1 is Plaintiffs’ the amount of damages incurred and Defendants unclean hands defense.

4. After the July 22, 2020 Case Management Conference, counsel for the Parties met and conferred regarding setting a case schedule through the close of discovery for Phase 2. The Court approved that schedule on August 8, 2021. *See* Dkt. No. 129.

5. On September 3, 2021, Plaintiffs filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings seeking to dismiss a number of counterclaims asserted in Defendants’ Second Amended Counterclaims and Answer to Third Amended Complaint (“Plaintiffs’ Motion”). *See* Dkt. No.

132. As of October 12, 2021, Plaintiffs' Motion was fully briefed and the parties agreed that the motion be submitted on the papers without oral argument. *See* Dkt. Nos. 136-138

6. On January 4, 2022, the Court notified the Parties that Plaintiffs' Motion would be taken under submission without oral argument. Dkt. No. 139. As of the time of this Stipulation, the Court has yet to rule on Plaintiffs' Motion.

7. The Parties agree that should the Court grant some or all of Plaintiffs' Motion, the scope of fact and expert discovery, the issues that can be determined on summary judgment, and the claims and defenses to be tried will be reduced. As a result, the Parties believe that in the interest of judicial economy, the current deadlines be extended by approximately ninety (90) days. This will allow the Court additional time to rule on Plaintiffs' Motion, while also conserving the resources of the parties and the Court and allowing the parties to conduct any discovery that may be necessitated by the Court's ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion.

8. Accordingly, the Parties have agreed that there is good cause to modify the case schedule for Phase 2 as follows:

Event	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Fact Discovery Cutoff	August 26, 2022	December 1, 2022
Deadline(s) for Filing Fact Discovery Motions	September 2, 2022	December 8, 2022
Designation of Opening Experts with Reports	September 16, 2022	December 22, 2022
Designation of Rebuttal Experts with Reports	October 17, 2022	January 23, 2023
Expert Discovery Cutoff	November 18, 2022	February 23, 2023
Deadline for Filing Dispositive and <i>Daubert</i> Motions	January 13, 2023	April 20, 2023
Last Day to File Oppositions to <i>Daubert</i> Motions	February 10, 2023	May 18, 2023
Last Day to File Replies to <i>Daubert</i> Motions	February 27, 2023	June 5, 2023

///

Hearing on Anticipated Dispositive and <i>Daubert</i> Motions	<i>See</i> the Court's Standing Order Section IV.A.1	<i>See</i> the Court's Standing Order Section IV.A.1
Joint Trial Setting Conference Statement	July 25, 2022	To be determined by the Court
Trial Setting Conference	August 4, 2022	To be determined by the Court

IT IS SO STIPULATED, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD.

Dated: June 21, 2022

HOPKINS & CARLEY
A Law CorporationBy: /s/ Jeffrey M. RatinoffJohn V. Picone III
Jeffrey M. Ratinoff
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and
Counter-Defendants
NEO4J, INC. and NEO4J SWEDEN AB

Dated: June 21, 2022

/s/ Adron W. BeeneAdron W. Beene
Adron G. Beene
Attorneys for Defendants and Counter-
Claimants
PURETHINK LLC, IGOV INC., and
JOHN MARK SUHY**IT IS SO ORDERED.**Dated: June 22, 2022

 EDWARD J. DAVILA
 United States District Court Judge

ATTESTATION OF E-FILED SIGNATURE

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby certify that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from all signatories for whom a signature is indicated by a “conformed” signature (/s/) within this electronically filed document and I have on file records to support this concurrence for subsequent production to the Court if so ordered or for inspection upon request.

Dated: June 21, 2022

HOPKINS & CARLEY
A Law Corporation

By: /s/ Jeffrey M. Ratinoff

John V. Picone III
Jeffrey M. Ratinoff
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and
Counter-Defendants
NEO4J, INC. and NEO4J SWEDEN AB