

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

6

7

8

Jesse Dupris )

NO. 08-8132-PCT-PGR

9

Plaintiff )

08-8133-PCT-PGR  
(CONSOLIDATED)

10

v. )

**ORDER**

11

Selanhongva McDonald, et al., )

12

Defendants. )

13

Upon consideration of the Parties' Stipulated Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Doc. 53),

14

15

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED GRANTING the Motion. (Doc. 53.) The Response is now due on April 19, 2010 and the Reply is now due on May 7, 2010.<sup>1</sup>

16

17

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Counsel is advised that the briefs are to be newly drafted briefs, not replicas of the previously filed briefs. Therein, counsel is advised to address each and every issue addressed in the Motion and corresponding responsive briefs. Furthermore, counsel is advised to cite to Ninth Circuit and Arizona law, and refrain from citing to other jurisdictions unless the foregoing is unavailable. Finally, counsel is advised that they *must comply* with the Local and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

18

19

20

21

22

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2010.

23

24



25

Paul G. Rosenblatt  
United States District Judge

26

27

28

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that counsel filed the Motion for Extension of Time on the date set by the Court as the deadline for the filing of the Response to the Motion to Dismiss. Counsel is advised that the Court is generally not inclined to grant such motions and will not do so again in the future.