1	BENJAMIN C. MIZER		
2	Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General JOSEPH H. HUNT		
	Director, Federal Programs Branch		
3	ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Deputy Branch Director		
4	JAMES J. GILLIGAN		
5	Special Litigation Counsel RODNEY PATTON		
6	Trial Attorney		
7	JULIA A. BERMAN		
8	Trial Attorney CAROLINE ANDERSON		
9	Trial Attorney		
10	U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 7320		
	Washington, D.C. 20044		
11	Phone: (202) 305-7919; Fax: (202) 616-8470 Attorneys for the Government Defs. in their Official Capacities		
12	INITED OF A TEC DISTRICT COLUT		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
14	OAKLAND DIVISION		
15	CAROLYN JEWEL, et al.,) Case No. 3:08-cv-04373-JSW		
16) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] Plaintiffs,) ORDER TO CANCEL THE		
17	v.) SCHEDULED HEARING ON		
18) PLAINTIFFS' RULE 54(B) MOTION NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY, et al.,) AND DECIDE THE MOTION ON THE		
19	PAPERS		
20	Defendants.) Courtroom 5, 2nd Floor		
21	Judge Jeffrey S. White		
22	Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 6-2, the		
23	Government Defendants request, and the parties, by and through their undersigned counsel,		
24	hereby stipulate to and respectfully request that the Court cancel the currently scheduled hearing		
25	on Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion and decide the motion on the papers submitted to the Court.		
26	The basis for this request and for the parties' stipulation is as follows:		
27			
28			
	Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Cancel the Scheduled Hearing on Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion and Decide the Motion on the Papers, <i>Jewel v. National Security Agency</i> (08-cv-4373-JSW)		

- On February 10, 2015, the Court issued an Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Granting Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, ECF No. 321.
- 2. On April 17, the same three Plaintiffs whose motion was the subject of the Court's February 10 ruling filed a Motion for Entry of Final Judgment on their Fourth Amendment Internet Content Interception Claim Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), ECF No. 323. In that motion, Plaintiffs asked the Court to set a hearing date of May 22.
- 3. The Government Defendants opposed the Rule 54(b) motion, ECF No. 324, and Plaintiffs filed a Reply in support of their motion, ECF No. 325, on May 8.
- 4. On May 14, 2015, counsel for the Government proposed to Plaintiffs' counsel a postponement of the hearing on the Rule 54(b) motion from May 22 until June 5 or June 12. The reasons for the requested postponement are as follows: Attendance by Government counsel at a hearing on May 22 would consume two days' time in crosscountry travel at a time when counsel for the Government Defendants all have pressing business and deadlines approaching in other cases. Specifically, but not exclusively, the Government's counsel in this case now have (as of May 13) a May 29 deadline for a motion to dismiss in another case involving NSA surveillance activities.
- 5. Counsel for Plaintiffs are eager to have their motion decided as soon as possible. Counsel for Plaintiffs also have a scheduling conflict with the Government's proposed June 5 hearing date and may also have a conflict with the other proposed date of June 12.
- 6. In the interests of accommodating all counsel's schedules in the coming weeks and to facilitate Plaintiffs' interest in having their Rule 54(b) motion decided expeditiously (rather than postponing any hearing until late June), the parties stipulate that, if the Court is agreeable, the May 22 hearing should be canceled and the Rule 54(b) motion decided on the papers that the parties have submitted.

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Cancel the Scheduled Hearing on Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion and Decide the Motion on the Papers, *Jewel v. National Security Agency* (08-cv-4373-JSW)

1	Dated: May 18, 2015	Respectfully Submitted,
2		
3		BENJAMIN C. MIZER Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
4		Timelput Deputy 718818tunt 71ttorney General
		JOSEPH H. HUNT
5		Director, Federal Programs Branch
6		ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
7		Deputy Branch Director
8		JAMES J. GILLIGAN
9		Special Litigation Counsel
9		RODNEY PATTON
10		Trial Attorney
11		JULIA A. BERMAN
11		Trial Attorney
12		CAROLINE ANDERSON
13		Trial Attorney
14		By: <u>/s/ Rodney Patton</u>
14		RODNEY PATTON
15		Trial Attorney
16		rodney.patton@usdoj.gov U.S. Department of Justice
10		Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
17		20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 7320
18		Washington, D.C. 20044
		Phone: (202) 305-7919
19		Fax: (202) 616-8470
20		Attorneys for the Government Defendants
21		Sued in their Official Capacities
22		
23		By: <u>/s/ Richard Wiebe</u>
24		RICHARD R. WIEBE (SBN 121156) LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD R. WIEBE
		One California Street, Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94111
25		Telephone: (415) 433-3200
26		Fax: (415) 433-6382 wiebe@pacbell.net
27		wicoe e pacocinici
28		

Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Cancel the Scheduled Hearing on Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion and Decide the Motion on the Papers, *Jewel v. National Security Agency* (08-cv-4373-JSW)

CINDY COHN 1 cindy@eff.org LEE TIEN 2 **KURT OPSAHL** 3 JAMES S. TYRE MARK RUMOLD 4 ANDREW CROCKER ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION 5 454 Shotwell Street 6 San Francisco, CA 94110 Telephone: (415) 436-9333 7 Fax: (415) 436-9993 8 Attorneys for Jewel Plaintiffs 9 10 11 **DECLARATION PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 5-1** 12 I, Rodney Patton, hereby declare pursuant to Local Rule 5-1, that I have obtained 13 Plaintiffs' concurrence in the filing of this document from Richard R. Wiebe, counsel for 14 Plaintiffs. 15 Executed on May 18, 2015, in Washington, D.C. 16 17 /s/ Rodney Patton 18 RODNEY PATTON 19 20 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, it is ORDERED that the May 22 hearing on Plaintiffs' 21 22 Rule 54(b) is canceled and that the motion will be decided on the parties' written submissions. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 25 Dated: 26 The Hon. Jeffrey S. White United States District Judge 27 28 Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to Cancel the Scheduled Hearing on Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion and Decide the Motion on the Papers, Jewel v. National Security Agency (08-cv-4373-JSW)