

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

9

Tom Bean, et al.,

) CV 11-8030-PCT-PGR

10

Plaintiffs,

)

**ORDER**

11

v.

)

12

Pearson Education, Inc.,

)

13

Defendant.

)

14

15

Before the Court is Defendant’s Motion for Leave to File Surreply in Further Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel. (Doc. 142.) Defendant asserts that Plaintiffs’ reply contains new arguments and inaccurate information. (*Id.*) Plaintiffs’ oppose the motion, arguing that the proposed surreply repeats Defendant’s previous arguments and discusses documents produced since Plaintiffs filed their motion to compel. (Doc. 144 at 2.)

16

17

18

19

20

The local rules make no provision for the filing of surreplies, see LRCiv 7.2, and the Court finds that the discovery issues pending before it have been adequately briefed. The Court notes that it will not consider any issues or evidence identified for the first time in Plaintiffs’ reply brief.

21

22

23

24

Accordingly,

25

IT IS ORDERED denying Defendant’s Motion for Leave to File Surreply (Doc. 142).

26

DATED this 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

27

28

Paul G. Rosenblatt  
United States District Judge