

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ARTHUR L. BRASHER, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Case No. 11-CV-0991
v.	)	
	)	Honorable James B. Zagel
BROADWIND ENERGY, INC., <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF ORDER GRANTING  
JOINT STIPULATION REGARDING SCHEDULING  
AND EXTENSION OF PAGE LIMITATIONS**

Plaintiffs Arthur Brasher, Jerry Pehlke, Jr., and Brian M. Grothues (“Plaintiffs”); Defendant Broadwind Energy, Inc. (“Broadwind”); Defendants J. Cameron Drecoll, Stephanie K. Kushner, Matthew J. Gadow, Stephen E. Graham, and Kevin E. Johnson (collectively, the “Officer Defendants”); Defendants James M. Lindstrom, David P. Reiland, Charles H. Beynon, William T. Fejes, and Terence P. Fox (collectively, the “Director Defendants”); and Defendants Tontine Capital Partners, L.P., Tontine Capital Overseas Master Fund, L.P., Tontine Partners, L.P., Tontine Overseas Fund, Ltd., Tontine 25 Overseas Master Fund, L.P., and Jeffrey Gendell (collectively, the “Tontine Defendants”), hereby move this Court for an order granting the Joint Stipulation Regarding Scheduling and Extension of Page Limitations, which was filed as Dkt. Entry # 57 on October 19, 2011. In support of this motion, the parties represent as follows:

1. Plaintiffs Arthur Brasher, Jerry Pehlke, Jr., and Brian M. Grothues filed an Amended Class Action Complaint for Violation of the Federal Securities Laws in the above-captioned action on September 13, 2011 (the “Amended Complaint”). The Complaint is 126 pages long and contains 286 paragraphs alleging two causes of actions against Defendants.

2. The Amended Complaint names certain defendants who were named in the original complaint, the Officer Defendants and Broadwind.

3. The Amended Complaint also names for the first time a number of new defendants, including the Tontine Defendants and the Director Defendants.

4. Defendants intend to file motions to dismiss the Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) and the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, which will challenge whether Plaintiffs have stated a claim for the substantive causes of action alleged against the respective Defendants in the Complaint. Currently, Broadwind, the Officer Defendants, and the Director Defendants intend to file one collective brief. The Tontine Defendants also intend to file one collective brief.

5. The Tontine Defendants waived service on September 19, 2011, and therefore must answer or otherwise plead on or before November 18, 2011. (Dkts. 42–47.) The Director Defendants waived service on September 21, 2011, and therefore must answer or otherwise plead by November 21, 2011. (Dkts. 48–52.)

6. The scheduling order previously entered by the Court on April 11, 2011 (Dkt. 19) provides for motions to dismiss to be filed 49 days after the filing of the Amended Complaint, which is November 1, 2011. This is several weeks before the dates by which the newly-named defendants must answer or otherwise plead.

7. The undersigned counsel, subject to the approval of the Court, have agreed and stipulated that the briefing scheduled previously entered on April 11, 2011 be modified as follows to provide for uniform dates for the filing of motions to dismiss, Plaintiffs' response, and Defendants' reply briefs:

a. Defendants' motions to dismiss and supporting memoranda shall be filed

on or before November 18, 2011.

- b. Plaintiffs' responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss shall be filed within 49 days of the filing of Defendants' motions to dismiss.
- c. Defendants' reply briefs in support of their motions to dismiss shall be filed within 28 days of the filing of Plaintiffs' responses.

8. Local Rule 7.1 provides that, unless otherwise permitted by this Court, all briefs in support of or in opposition to motions shall be limited to fifteen (15) pages.

9. Although the parties have agreed to keep their briefs in support of and in opposition to the motions to dismiss as concise as possible, they also agree that the Complaint and the anticipated motions to dismiss raise a number of issues that cannot be adequately and effectively addressed within the 15-page limitation of Local Rule 7.1, particularly when Defendants have agreed to file two briefs on behalf of seventeen (17) separately named Defendants. Accordingly, the parties agree that extending the page limitations would assist the Court in deciding the issues raised in the motions.

10. The undersigned counsel, subject to the approval of the Court, have further agreed and stipulated that the page limitation of Local Rule 7.1 be modified as follows:

- a. The memorandum in support of the collective motion to dismiss filed by the Tontine Defendants shall be no longer than twenty (20) pages.
- b. The memorandum in support of the collective motion to dismiss filed by Broadwind, the Officer Defendants, and the Director Defendants shall be no longer than forty-five (45) pages.
- c. Plaintiffs' opposition to the Tontine Defendants' motion to dismiss shall be no longer than twenty (20) pages, and Plaintiffs' opposition to

Broadwind, the Officer Defendants, and the Director Defendants' motion to dismiss shall be no longer than forty-five (45) pages.

- d. The reply in support of the collective motion to dismiss filed by the Tontine Defendants shall be no longer than fifteen (15) pages.
- e. The reply in support of the collective motion to dismiss filed by Broadwind, the Officer Defendants, and the Director Defendants shall be no longer than twenty (20) pages.

WHEREFORE, the parties respectfully request that this Court enter an order granting the Joint Stipulation Regarding Scheduling and Extension of Page Limitations. Pursuant to the Court's Case Management Procedures, a copy of the stipulation is being submitted to the Court via email.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2011

/s/ Meredith Jenkins Laval  
James W. Ducayet  
Kristen R. Seeger  
Meredith Jenkins Laval  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
One South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 853-7000

*Counsel for Broadwind, the Officer  
Defendants, and the Director  
Defendants*

Date: November 1, 2011

/s/ John Conroy Martin  
John Conroy Martin  
LAW OFFICES OF JOHN C. MARTIN  
30 North LaSalle Street, #3400  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
Tel: (312) 368-9000

Gary Stein  
Michael G. Cutini  
SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL LLP  
919 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel: (212) 756-2441

*Counsel for the Tontine Defendants*

Date: November 1, 2011

/s/ James T. Crotty  
James T. Crotty  
JAMES T. CROTTY & ASSOCIATES  
208 S. LaSalle St., Suite 1750  
Chicago, IL 60604  
(312) 623-1599

William B. Federman  
Jennifer S. Montagna  
FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD  
10205 N. Pennsylvania Avenue  
Oklahoma City, OK 73120  
(405) 235-1560

Samuel H. Rudman  
Joseph Russello  
ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD  
LLP  
58 South Service Road, Suite 200  
Melville, NY 11747  
(631) 367-7100

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Meredith Jenkins Laval, one of Broadwind Energy, Inc.'s attorneys, hereby certify that on November 1, 2011, service of the foregoing Joint Motion for Entry of Order Granting Stipulation Regarding Scheduling and Extension of Page Limitations was accomplished pursuant to ECF as to Filing Users and in compliance with LR 5.5 as to any party who is not a Filing User or represented by a Filing User.

/s/ Meredith Jenkins Laval  
Meredith Jenkins Laval