

1 Erwin Chemerinsky (*pro hac vice*)
echemerinsky@law.berkeley.edu
2 Claudia Polsky (State Bar No. 185505)
cpolsky@law.berkeley.edu
3 U.C. BERKELEY SCHOOL OF LAW
Law Building
4 Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
Telephone: (510) 642-6483

5 Elizabeth J. Cabraser (State Bar No. 83151)
ecabraser@lchb.com
6 Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607)
rheimann@lchb.com
7 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
8 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
9 Telephone: (415) 956-1000

10 Anthony P. Schoenberg (State Bar No. 203714)
tschoenberg@fbm.com
11 Donald Sobelman (State Bar No. 184028)
dsobelman@fbm.com
12 Linda S. Gilleran (State Bar No. 307107)
lgilleran@fbm.com
13 Dylan M. Silva (State Bar No. 306363)
dmsilva@fbm.com
14 Kyle A. McLorg (State Bar No. 332136)
kmcclorg@fbm.com
15 Katherine T. Balkoski (State Bar No. 353366)
kbalkoski@fbm.com
16 Farella Braun + Martel LLP
One Bush Street, Suite 900
17 San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 954-4400
18 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*
[Additional counsel listed on signature page]
20

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
22 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

23 NEETA THAKUR, et al.,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

27 Defendants.
28

Case No. 3:25-cv-04737-RL

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER AS MODIFIED**

Judge: The Honorable Rita F. Lin

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12, Plaintiffs and Defendants (“the Parties”), through their
2 respective undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree as follows.

3 1. Pursuant to the Court’s Scheduling and Stay Order (ECF No. 183), the Parties are
4 currently set to begin summary judgment briefing on June 5, 2026 and to complete briefing on
5 August 14, 2026. The hearing on the cross-motions for summary judgment is set for September 1,
6 2026, at 10:00 am.

7 2. The Parties hereby request to extend the briefing schedule and hearing date by
8 roughly 30 days, for the reasons set forth below.

9 3. The Parties recognize and acknowledge that the Court expressed it “does not
10 anticipate changing the hearing date . . . or the date by which all briefing on the motions will be
11 completed,” (ECF No. 197). Nevertheless, the Parties believe good cause exists for their requested
12 extension.

13 4. As explained in their Joint Statement to extend the discovery period (ECF No.
14 195), the Parties have been working diligently and cooperatively for several months to finalize a
15 set of detailed factual stipulations intended to streamline the record, reduce or obviate the need for
16 written discovery and depositions, and avoid unnecessary motion practice.

17 5. The Parties have reached final agreement on stipulations relating to the non-DOE
18 agencies except EPA, which has provided proposed settlement terms that the Parties anticipate
19 finalizing within roughly a week. The Parties have agreed to 14 stipulations. The Parties have
20 likewise identified 17 categories of information about each terminated grant that the agencies will
21 fill out as part of a comprehensive spreadsheet. At the time the agency produces the spreadsheet,
22 the Parties will also sign an additional stipulation. The agencies estimate that the spreadsheets and
23 secondary stipulations will be produced on the following schedule:

- 24 • HHS-NIH
 - 25 ○ Approximately 4 weeks.
- 26 • NEH
 - 27 ○ Approximately 2-3 weeks.
- 28 • NSF
 - Approximately 3-4 weeks.
- DoD
 - Approximately 3-4 weeks.

- 1 • DoT
- 2 ○ Approximately 2 weeks.

3 Preparing these spreadsheets is a time-consuming endeavor given the highly detailed
4 nature of the information that they will set forth. These stipulations will obviate the need for
5 discovery as to these agencies. As of the time of the filing of this stipulation, the Parties have
6 signed the agreement and 14 stipulations for all the non-DOE agencies except EPA, namely, NSF;
7 NEH; DoD; HHS-NIH; and DoT.

8 6. As to DOE, the Parties likewise anticipate signing stipulations as to both sides
9 within the week. The Parties have prepared 11 stipulations that obviate the need for discovery as
10 to DOE. The Parties are also finalizing stipulations as to the discovery served on the named
11 plaintiffs associated with DOE.

12 7. The process of agreeing to the stipulations has been very involved, with ongoing
13 and frequent collaborations and discussions between the Parties over the course of months.
14 Ultimately, the Parties were able to agree to obviate the need for discovery on either side, saving
15 both Parties significant time and resources. Given the depth of the discussions, the seriousness of
16 forsaking traditional discovery, and the chains of approval needed on both sides in order to sign
17 off on the stipulations, the Parties do not believe they could have acted more expeditiously.

18 8. Now that stipulations have been signed, the agencies can begin preparing the
19 information set to be produced via spreadsheet. This information is relevant to the summary
20 judgment and class certification motion, and will take the agencies some time to compile. As this
21 time will likely extend beyond the discovery deadline, the Parties believe a roughly 30-day
22 extension is justified to allow Plaintiffs to present their case using all relevant information.
23 Plaintiffs would be prejudiced without the extension, rendering the collaborative work on the
24 stipulations and spreadsheet terms for naught.

25 9. Furthermore, the Parties believe that a roughly 30-day extension will allow them to
26 brief all issues—DOE and non-DOE specific—on the same timeline. Given the differing state of
27 discovery in the *Thakur* and *Wright* cases, the Parties do not at this time believe that coordinating
28 briefing on the DOE-specific issues with the *Wright* case is advantageous. The Parties believe the

1 benefits of keeping all issues in the *Thakur* case on the same timeline also weigh in favor of
2 extending the briefing deadline.

3 10. Once it became clear the stipulations would obviate the need for discovery, the
4 Parties met and conferred multiple times to discuss an appropriate schedule for summary judgment
5 briefing, agreeing that an extension would be necessary to allow the agencies sufficient time to
6 produce the requested information and to allow Plaintiffs sufficient time to review this information
7 and incorporate it into summary judgment briefing.

8 11. The Parties re-convened to discuss the briefing schedule after receiving the Court's
9 order in ECF No. 197. The Parties originally contemplated a longer extension, but appreciate the
10 Court's instruction and the urgency of this matter. Nevertheless, the Parties believe a roughly 30-
11 day extension is necessary to allow the Defendant agencies to produce the stipulated information
12 while giving Plaintiffs sufficient time to diligently prepare their summary judgment motion.

13 12. In addition to the Parties' recent request to extend the discovery deadline by two
14 weeks, the Parties have previously stipulated to extended schedules on September 9, 2025 and
15 November 20, 2025, and the Court granted both of those stipulated schedule modifications.

16 13. Accordingly, the Parties jointly propose the following summary judgment briefing
17 schedule:

Event	Current Deadline	Parties' Stipulated Proposed Deadline
Plaintiffs' Summary Judgment	6/5/2026	7/15/2026
Defendants' Opposition and Cross Motion for Summary Judgment	7/2/2026	8/11/2026
Plaintiffs' Reply and Opposition to Cross Motion	7/31/2026	9/8/2026
Defendants' Reply	8/14/2026	9/22/2026

Hearing	9/1/2026	10/20/2026
---------	----------	-------------------

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPUALTED AND AGREED, by and between the Parties, subject to the Court’s approval, that the schedule shall be modified as reflected above.

Dated: May 12, 2026

By: /s/ Elizabeth Cabraser

Anthony P. Schoenberg (State Bar No. 203714)
 tschoenberg@fbm.com
 Donald Sobelman (State Bar No. 184028)
 dsobelman@fbm.com
 Linda S. Gilleran (State Bar No. 307107)
 lgilleran@fbm.com
 Dylan M. Silva (State Bar No. 306363)
 dmsilva@fbm.com
 Kyle A. McLorg (State Bar No. 332136)
 kmclorg@fbm.com
 Katherine T. Balkoski (State Bar No. 353366)
 kbalkoski@fbm.com
 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP
 One Bush Street, Suite 900
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 954-4400

Erwin Chemerinsky (*pro hac vice*)
 echemerinsky@law.berkeley.edu
 Claudia Polsky (State Bar No. 185505)
 cpolsky@law.berkeley.edu
 U.C. BERKELEY SCHOOL OF LAW
 Law Building
 Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
 Telephone: (510) 642-6483

Elizabeth J. Cabraser (State Bar No. 83151)
 ecabraser@lchb.com
 Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607)
 rheimann@lchb.com
 Kevin R. Budner (State Bar No. 287271)
 kbudner@lchb.com
 Annie M. Wanless (State Bar No. 339635)
 awanless@lchb.com
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
 BERNSTEIN, LLP
 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 956-1000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: May 12, 2026

By: /s/ Jason Altabet

Respectfully submitted,
BRETT A. SHUMATE
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

ERIC J. HAMILTON
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JOSEPH E. BORSON
Assistant Branch Director

JASON ALTABET (Md. Bar No. 2211280012)
Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel.: (202) 305-0727
Email: jason.k.altabet2@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for United States

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION AS MODIFIED, IT IS SO ORDERED.

May 14, 2026



The Honorable Rita F. Lin
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(D)(3)

I, Elizabeth Cabraser, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that all signatories have concurred in this filing.

DATED: May 12, 2026

/s/ Elizabeth Cabraser
Elizabeth Cabraser