

1 THOMAS P. LAMBERT (SBN 50952),  
tpl@msk.com  
2 JEAN PIERRE NOGUES (SBN 84445),  
jpn@msk.com  
3 KEVIN E. GAUT (SBN 117352),  
keg@msk.com  
4 MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP  
11377 West Olympic Boulevard  
5 Los Angeles, California 90064-1683  
Telephone: (310) 312-2000  
6 Facsimile: (310) 312-3100

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counterdefendants  
8 Manwin Licensing International S.à.r.l.  
and Digital Playground, Inc.

9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12

13 MANWIN LICENSING  
INTERNATIONAL S.A.R.L., a  
14 Luxemburg limited liability company  
(s.à.r.l.), and DIGITAL  
15 PLAYGROUND, INC., a California  
corporation,

16 Plaintiffs,

17

v.

18

19 ICM REGISTRY, LLC, d/b/a .XXX, a  
Delaware limited liability corporation;  
20 INTERNET CORPORATION FOR  
ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS,  
a California nonprofit public benefit  
21 corporation; and Does 1-10,

22 Defendants.

23

24

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

25

26

27

28

Case No. CV11- 9514 PSG (JCGx)

The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez

**STIPULATION OF ALL PARTIES  
TO CONTINUE RULE 16  
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

Courtroom: 880 Roybal Federal Building

1 This Stipulation is entered into between and among all parties to the action,  
2 through their undersigned counsel of record, with reference to the following facts:

3 1. This is an antitrust action by Plaintiffs Manwin Licensing  
4 International S.A.R.L. and Digital Playground, Inc. (collectively, “Manwin”)   
5 against defendants Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers  
6 (“ICANN”) and ICM Registry LLC (“ICM”). The complaint is now at issue,  
7 defendants having each filed their answers.

8 2. ICM has filed antitrust and state law counterclaims against Manwin.

9 3. On December 7, 2012, Manwin filed motions to dismiss and/or to  
10 strike ICM’s counterclaims. (Doc. Nos. 75, 76). On January 14, 2013, ICM filed  
11 its oppositions to the motions. (Doc. Nos. 78, 80). On January 28, 2013, Manwin  
12 filed replies to ICM’s oppositions to the motions. (Doc. Nos. 84, 85). The  
13 motions were originally scheduled to be heard on February 11, 2013, but the  
14 hearing was continued by this court to February 15, 2013.

15 4. The Rule 16(b) Scheduling Conference is currently set for March 18,  
16 2013.

17 5. In light of that date, the parties’ counsel are required under Federal  
18 Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26(f)(1) to conduct a meeting by not later than  
19 February 25, 2013 to discuss such matters as a discovery plan and to make initial  
20 disclosures.

21 6. The parties believe that the Rule 26 meeting can be productively  
22 conducted only after the counterclaims have been settled. As a result of the  
23 pending motions, ICM’s existing counterclaims might or might not be limited or  
24 eliminated. Amended counterclaims might or might not be permitted or filed.  
25 Manwin might now, or after an amended pleading, be required to file an answer  
26 which would assert various affirmative defenses. The parties believe the final  
27 scope of the counterclaims, and any affirmative defenses to the counterclaims,

1 should be considered when discussing, and may affect such matters as, the  
2 appropriate scope and ordering of discovery, required disclosures, and other topics  
3 to be discussed at the Rule 26 meeting.

4 7. For that reason, the parties believe that the Rule 16(b) Scheduling  
5 Conference should be continued to allow the Rule 26(f) Conference to take place  
6 after the pleadings (and in particular the counterclaims) have been fully settled.  
7 The parties believe that a continuance of approximately seventy five (75) days, to a  
8 date during the week of June 4-7, 2013, will be sufficient for that purpose.

9 8. The Rule 16(b) Scheduling Conference was continued previously to  
10 allow for ICM to file its amended counterclaims and for Manwin to respond  
11 thereto, and to accommodate pre-paid travel plans of ICM's counsel. The parties  
12 do not believe continuing the Rule 16(b) Scheduling Conference will affect any  
13 other deadlines.

14 //

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 //

22

23

24

25

26

27 //

28 Mitchell  
Silberberg &  
Knupp LLP

1 Based on these facts, the parties stipulate that the Rule 16(b) Scheduling  
2 Conference shall be continued for approximately seventy five (75) days, to a date  
3 during the week of June 4-7, 2013, to permit the settling of the pleadings before the  
4 required Rule 26(f) Conference.

5 SO STIPULATED.

6 DATED: February 21, 2013

THOMAS P. LAMBERT  
JEAN PIERRE NOGUES  
KEVIN E. GAUT  
MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP LLP

7  
8

9 By: /s/Kevin E. Gaut  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and  
Counterdefendants

11 DATED: February 21, 2013

RICHARD P. SYBERT  
HAZEL MAE B. PANGAN  
GORDON & REES LLP

12  
13

14 By: /s/Richard P. Sybert  
15 Attorneys for Defendant  
ICM REGISTRY, LLC d/b/a .XXX

16 DATED: February 21, 2013

JEFFREY A. LeVEE  
JONES DAY

17  
18

19 By: /s/Jeffrey A. LeVee  
20 Attorneys for Defendant  
INTERNET CORPORATION FOR  
ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS

21

**Attestation Regarding Signatures**

22 I, Kevin E. Gaut, attest that all signatories listed, and on whose behalf the  
23 filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.  
24

25 DATED: February 21, 2013

By: /s/Kevin E. Gaut  
Kevin E. Gaut

26  
27