

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN
& BERNSTEIN, LLP

ELIZABETH J. CABRASER (SBN 083151)
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.956.1000
Facsimile: 415.956.1008
Email: ecabraser@lchb.com

Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
DAVID M. CHEIFETZ (*PRO HAC VICE*)

180 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038
Telephone: 212.806.5400
Email: jbernard@stroock.com

CLARENCE DYER & COHEN LLP

JOSH A. COHEN (SBN 217853)
899 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
Telephone: 415.749.1800
Email: jcohen@clarencedyer.com

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

MARK DAVID MCPHERSON (SBN 307951)
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 415.268.7000
Email: mmcpherson@mofo.com

TODD & WELD LLP

INGRID S. MARTIN (*PRO HAC VICE*)
One Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: 617.720.2626
Email: imartin@toddweld.com

Attorneys for McKinsey Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: MCKINSEY & CO., INC. NATIONAL
PRESCRIPTION OPIATE CONSULTANT
LITIGATION

This Document Relates to: ALL ACTIONS

) Case No. 3:21-md-02996-CRB (SK)

) **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]**
) **ORDER REGARDING PAGE LIMITS**
) **FOR BRIEFING ON INITIAL MOTIONS**
) **TO DISMISS**

STIPULATION

WHEREAS, the Court previously entered a briefing schedule directing McKinsey to file initial motions to dismiss by December 23, 2020; Plaintiffs to file oppositions to the motions to dismiss by February 14, 2022; and McKinsey to file reply briefs by March 21, 2022 (Dkt. 282);

WHEREAS, the Court previously granted a stipulation extending the page limits for briefing for the initial motions to dismiss on December 17, 2021 (Dkt. 306);

WHEREAS, the Court's order extending the page limits contemplated that Plaintiffs would determine how many pages they would need to oppose McKinsey's motion to dismiss based on the effect of McKinsey's settlement with the state Attorneys General after reviewing the motion;

WHEREAS, McKinsey filed its initial motions to dismiss on December 23, 2021 (Dkts. 310-13);

WHEREAS, given the scope of the issues raised by McKinsey in its motion to dismiss based on the effect of McKinsey's settlement with the state Attorneys General, Plaintiffs believe the issues in the motion cannot be addressed adequately within the number of pages contemplated by the local rules and this Court's standing orders;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs contemplate filing two briefs in opposition to McKinsey's motion to dismiss based on the effect of McKinsey's settlement with the state Attorneys General, one on behalf of the subdivision plaintiffs, and one on behalf of the school district plaintiffs;

WHEREAS, the parties have met and conferred about extending page limits given these limitations;

WHEREAS, the parties have agreed on an extended page limit for Plaintiffs' oppositions to McKinsey's motion to dismiss based on the effect of McKinsey's settlement with the Attorneys General, but McKinsey wishes to review the opposition before determining how many pages it will need to reply in support of its motion;

1 NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby agree and stipulate to the following page limits
2 with respect to McKinsey's motion to dismiss based on the effect of McKinsey's settlement with
3 the state Attorneys General:

4 Opposition brief on behalf of the subdivisions: 60 pages

5 Opposition brief on behalf of the school districts: 6 pages

6 Reply Brief: To be determined

7 IT IS SO STIPULATED.
8

9 Dated: February 7, 2022

STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
DAVID M. CHEIFETZ

11 By: /s/ David M. Cheifetz
David M. Cheifetz

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13
14

15 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN,
16 LLP
ELIZABETH J. CABRASER


17 By: /s/ Elizabeth J. Cabraser
18 Elizabeth J. Cabraser

19
20 Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

Pursuant to stipulation, and for good cause shown, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 8, 2022



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE