

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Jessica Valenzuela, Bar No. 220934
jvalenzuela@gibsondunn.com
Jeff Lombard, Bar No. 285371
jlombard@gibsondunn.com
310 University Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301-1744
Telephone: 650.849.5300
Facsimile: 650.849.5333

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Jordan Estes (*pro hac vice*)
jestes@gibsondunn.com
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193
Telephone: 212.351.4000
Facsimile: 212.351.4035

*Attorneys for PubMatic, Inc., Rajeev K. Goel, and
Steven Pantelick*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SIDNEY HSU, Individually and on Behalf of
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PUBMATIC, INC., RAJEEV K. GOEL, and
STEVEN PANTELICK,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:25-cv-07067-JSC

**STIPULATED REQUEST AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON
DEFENDANTS' ANTICIPATED
MOTION TO DISMISS THE SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Judge: Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley
Date Action Filed: August 20, 2025

Pursuant to Rules 6-2 and 7-12 of the Northern District of California Civil Local Rules, Plaintiff Sidney Hsu (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants PubMatic, Inc. (“PubMatic”), Rajeev K. Goel, and Steven Pantelick (“Defendants,” and together with Plaintiff, the “Parties”), hereby agree and stipulate that good cause exists to request an order from the Court setting the schedule for Defendants’ response to the Second Amended Complaint (defined below) and for briefing on Defendants’ anticipated motion to dismiss.

WHEREAS, on August 20, 2025, Plaintiff filed a putative class action complaint against Defendants for alleged violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5 promulgated thereunder (the “Complaint”);

WHEREAS, this action is governed by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the “PSLRA”), which imposes an automatic stay of discovery during the pendency of a motion to dismiss (15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(3)(B));

WHEREAS, on October 25, 2025, the Court appointed Sidney Hsu as Lead Plaintiff and Glancy Prongay & Murray (now known as Glancy Prongay Wolke & Rotter LLP) as Lead Counsel pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B) (Dkt. 31);

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2026, Plaintiff filed the Amended Class Action Complaint (Dkt. 38) (the “First Amended Complaint”);

WHEREAS, on April 10, 2026, Defendants moved to dismiss the First Amended Complaint (Dkt. 39);

WHEREAS, on July 27, 2026, the Court granted Defendants’ motion to dismiss the First Amended Complaint with leave to amend and ordered Plaintiff to file any further amended complaint (the “Second Amended Complaint”) by September 4, 2026 (Dkt. 48);

WHEREAS, the Parties believe that, given the requirements of the PSLRA and in order to conserve the Court’s and the Parties’ resources, good cause exists to set the schedule below, which affords Defendants a reasonable opportunity to evaluate and respond

2
STIPULATED REQUEST AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE
ON DEFENDANTS’ ANTICIPATED MOTION TO DISMISS THE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

CASE NO. 3:25-CV-07067-JSC

1 to the Second Amended Complaint and affords Plaintiff a comparable period in which to
2 oppose any motion to dismiss.

3 **WHEREAS**, the previous time modifications in this action are: (1) the Court's
4 October 15, 2025 Order (Dkt. 14) extending Defendants' time to respond to the Complaint
5 and vacating the Initial Case Management Conference, all associated deadlines, and the
6 ADR deadlines; and (2) the Court's December 11, 2025 Order (Dkt. 35) setting the schedule
7 for filing of the First Amended Complaint and responsive briefing;

8 **WHEREAS**, the Parties do not seek to reset these dates for the purpose of delay,
9 and the proposed new dates will not have an effect on any additional pre-trial and trial dates
10 as the Court has yet to schedule these dates.

11 **NOW, THEREFORE**, the Parties, subject to approval of the Court, hereby stipulate
12 and agree as follows:

13 1. Defendants shall answer, move to dismiss, or otherwise respond to the Second
14 Amended Complaint on or before October 20, 2026.

15 2. Plaintiff shall file any opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss on or before
16 December 4, 2026.

17 3. Defendants shall file any reply in support of their motion to dismiss on or before
18 January 19, 2027.

19 4. Nothing in this stipulation shall be construed as a waiver of any of the Parties'
20 rights or positions in law or equity, or as a waiver of any claims or defenses that the Parties
21 otherwise would have.

22 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

23
24
25
26
27
28
3
STIPULATED REQUEST AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE
ON DEFENDANTS' ANTICIPATED MOTION TO DISMISS THE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

CASE NO. 3:25-CV-07067-JSC

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 8, 2026

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By: /s/ Jessica Valenzuela

Jessica Valenzuela

Attorney for Defendant PubMatic, Inc., Rajeev K. Goel, and Steven Pantelick

Dated: September 8, 2026

GLANCY PRONGAY WOLKE & ROTTER LLP

By: /s/ Ex Kano S. Sams II

Ex Kano S. Sams II

Attorney for Plaintiff Sidney Hsu

* * *

ECF ATTESTATION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from all other signatories.

Dated: September 8, 2026

/s/ Jessica Valenzuela

Jessica Valenzuela

[PROPOSED] ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2026

Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley
United States District Judge