

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
 7960 Soquel Drive Suite #296
 Aptos, CA 95003
 Tel: (408) 392-9233

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, a Swedish
 corporation,

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
 BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON MOTION TO
 DISMISS DEFENDANTS' FIRST CAUSE
 OF ACTION IN THEIR THIRD
 AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM**

[Civil L.R. 6-2 and 7-12]

Date: April 27, 2023
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Dept.: Courtroom 4, 5th Floor

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Trial Date: November 14, 2023

STIPULATION

This Stipulation is made between Plaintiffs Neo4j, Inc. and Neo4j Sweden AB (collectively “Plaintiffs”) and Defendants PureThink LLC, iGov Inc. and John Mark Suhy (collectively, “Defendants”). Plaintiffs and Defendants (collectively, the “Parties”) HEREBY STIPULATE through their respective counsel to a modification of the briefing schedule on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Dismiss Defendants’ First Cause of Action in Their Third Amended Counterclaim (“Motion to Dismiss”) as follows:

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their Motion Dismiss (Dkt. No. 171) on February 9, 2023.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Civ. L.R. 7-3(a), Defendants’ opposition is presently due February 23, 2023.

WHEREAS, Presidents’ Day, which is federal holiday presently falls with the time for Defendants to prepare and file their opposition.

WHEREAS, if Defendants were to file their opposition on February 23, 2023, Plaintiffs’ reply brief would be due on March 2, 2023 pursuant to Civ. L.R. 7-3(c).

WHEREAS, the attorney for Plaintiffs who will be responsible for drafting the reply brief in response to Defendants’ opposition has a previously scheduled vacation during the time Plaintiffs would have to prepare and file that reply brief.

WHEREAS, to accommodate these scheduling issues, the Parties agree that the deadline to file Defendants’ opposition should be extended from February 23, 2023 to March 2, 2023, and the deadline to file Plaintiffs’ reply brief should be extended to March 16, 2023.

WHEREAS, the hearing on the Motion to Dismiss is currently set for April 27, 2023.

WHEREAS, the respective extensions on the Parties’ remaining briefs will still provide the Court with 42 days before the hearing to review the Parties’ respective papers after they are submitted, and thus is still in compliance with the minimum time required by Civ. L.R. 7-3(a).

WHEREAS, the requested time modification will have no effect on the schedule for the case other than as stated herein.

///

///

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED THAT:

1. Defendants shall have until March 2, 2023 to file their opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss.

2. Plaintiffs shall have until March 16, 2023 to file their reply to Defendants' opposition to the Motion to Dismiss.

Dated: February 15, 2023

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

Dated: February 15, 2023

/s/ Adron W. Beene

Adron W. Beene
Adron G. Beene
Attorneys for Defendants and Counter-
Claimants
PURETHINK LLC, IGOV INC., and
JOHN MARK SUHY

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

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: February 15, 2023

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