

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



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

POR VIDA PRODUCTIONS, LLC;)	Case No. CV 11-01944 DDP (JCx)
DFL RELEASING LLC; ALAN)	
JACOBS; SCOTT WILLIAM)	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' EX
ALVAREZ,)	PARTE APPLICATIONS TO STRIKE
)	PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITIONS TO
Plaintiffs,)	DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS IN LIMINE
)	
v.)	Docket Nos. 99, 100
)	
CHRISTOPHER HARRISON;)	
DARRICK ROBINSON; TRINA)	
CALDERON,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Defendants have filed an Ex Parte Application to Strike Plaintiffs' Oppositions to Defendants' Motions in Limine and an amended version of that Ex Parte Application (the "Applications"). Docket Nos. 99, 100. The Applications argue that Plaintiffs' Oppositions to Defendants' Motions in Limine were filed late, in violation of Central District Local Rule 7-9, which requires an opposition to be filed at least twenty-one days before the hearing. Defendants ask for sanctions and for Plaintiffs' Opposition to be stricken.

///

1 There is a separate issue as to whether the Local Rules'
2 briefing deadlines apply to motions in limine. The parties have
3 not addressed this issue. The Court notes that these briefing
4 deadlines are frequently not applied to motions in limine.

5 Additionally, Defendants have not cited any cases in which a
6 court struck an opposition to a motion in limine for failure to
7 follow Local Rule 7-9. The Court's own research indicates that the
8 few cases that have discussed the Local Rules' briefing deadlines
9 in the motion in limine context have not strictly adhered to those
10 deadlines. See Allen v. City of Los Angeles, CV 10-4695 CAS RCX,
11 2012 WL 1641712, at * 1 n.2 (C.D. Cal. May 7, 2012) ("Plaintiff
12 objects to defendants' motions in limine on the grounds that
13 defendants failed to . . . file their motions in a manner that
14 would afford plaintiff sufficient time to file her opposition as
15 required by Local Rule 7-9. While the Court admonishes defendants
16 to follow all local rules, the Court does not believe that their
17 failure to do so requires denial of their motions in this
18 instance."); Estate of Gonzales v. Hickman, 05-660 MMM (RCX), 2007
19 WL 3237727, at * 14 (C.D. Cal. May 30, 2007). The case Defendants
20 cite in favor of striking Plaintiff's Opposition, Metzger v.
21 Hussman, 682 F. Supp. 1109 (D. Nev. 1988), concerned a motion to
22 dismiss, not a motions in limine.

23 For these reasons, the Applications are DENIED.
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26 Dated: June 12, 2013


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge

27
28