1 2	MICHAEL F. HERTZ Acting Assistant Attorney General DOUGLAS N. LETTER		
3	Terrorism Litigation Counsel JOSEPH H. HUNT		
	Director, Federal Programs Branch		
4	ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Special Litigation Counsel		
5	ALEXANDER K. HAAS (SBN 220932) Trial Attorney		
6	U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch		
7	20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 6102 Washington, D.C. 20001		
8	Phone: (202) 514-4782—Fax: (202) 616-8460  Attorneys for the United States of America		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10			
11	DUDE NATIONAL CECUDITY ACENCY	No. M:06-cv-01791-VRW	
12	IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS  Output  Description  Output  Descr	COUNTY A MICHAEL AND BOOK OF	
13	LITIGATION	ORDER TO RESET BRIEFING AND	
14	This Document Relates To:	HEARING SCHEDULE	
15	United States v. Rabner, et al. (07-1324);	Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker	
16	United States v. Gaw, et al. (07-1242); United States v. Adams, et al. (07-1323);	Hearing: April 1, 2009	
17	United States v. Palermino, et al. (07-1326); United States v. Volz, et al. (07-1396);		
18	Clayton, et al. v. AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., et al. (07-1187)		
19			
20	RECITALS		
21	1. On December 23, 2008, United States filed an eight-page motion for summary		
22	judgment in the above-captioned state cases pursuant to Section 803 of the FISA Amendments		
23	Act, 50 U.S.C. § 1885b. The United States noticed that motion for March 26, 2009, and the		
	Court subsequently reset the hearing for April 1, 2	2009. See Dkt. 539 in 06-cv-01791.	
24	2. The state officials sought to defer	all briefing on the United States' motion, see	
25	Dkt. 543 in 06-cv-01791, until the Court issued a	ruling on separate issues concerning Section	
26	802 of the FISA Amendments Act, see 50 U.S.C.	§ 1885a. The United States opposed this	
27	request, see Dkt. 549 in 06-cv-01791.		
28	3. After the Court denied the requeste	ed deferral of briefing, see Dkt. 558 in 06-cv-	
	No. M:06-cv-01791-VRW Stipulation and Proposed Order	to Reset Briefing and Hearing Schedule	

1

2

5

6

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

01791, the United States again approached the state officials to suggest a modification of briefing and hearing schedule.

- 4. Consistent with the terms of the minute order that set the April 1, 2009 Hearing, the United States, state officials, and telecommunication carrier defendants in the state cases have reached agreement on and seek the Court's approval of a modified schedule for the state cases and submit this stipulation and proposed order. Under the proposed schedule: (i) the opposition to the United States' motion would be filed by March 20, 2009; (ii) the United States would reply by April 9, 2009; (iii) the telecommunication carrier defendants may respond to the United States' motion and any response thereto by April 9, 2009; and (iv) a sur-reply could be filed by April 23, 2009.
- 5. Under this schedule, the parties ask that the current hearing be reset to May 7, 2009, which is currently indicated as an open hearing date on the Court's website, or as soon thereafter as is convenient for the Court.

## **STIPULATION**

The United States, state officials, and telecommunication carrier defendants, through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate to the following schedule, and request that the Court make this stipulation an order of the Court:

March 20, 2009	Opposition to the United States' motion for summary judgment in the State Cases
April 9, 2009	United States replies in support of its motion
	Telecommunication carrier defendants respond to the United States' motion and any responses thereto
April 23, 2009	Sur-reply of the state officials
May 7, 2009	Hearing on the United States' motion

DATED: February 24, 2009	Respectfully Submitted,
	MICHAEL F. HERTZ Acting Assistant Attorney General DOUGLAS N. LETTER Terrorism Litigation Counsel JOSEPH H. HUNT Director, Federal Programs Branch ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Special Litigation Counsel

## PROPOSED ORDER

Pursuant to the foregoing stipulation, and good cause appearing, it is hereby ORDERED

that:

viiav.		
March 20, 2009	Opposition to the United States' motion for summary judgment in the State Cases	
April 9, 2009	United States replies in support of its motion	
	Telecommunication carrier defendants respond to the United States' motion and any responses thereto	
April 23, 2009	Sur-reply of the state officials	
May 7, 2009	Hearing on the United States' motion	

IT IS SO ORDERED

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

a States Districe

hief Judge