

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

CAROL-LEE ZUVICH, et al.,	)	Case No. CV 11-06832 DDP (AJWx)
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>ORDER DENYING IN PART AND</b>
	)	<b>GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFFS' EX</b>
v.	)	<b>PARTE APPLICATION</b>
	)	
CITY OF LOS ANGELES,	)	[Docket No. 87]
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

Presently before the court is Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application to Strike Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, and/or to Schedule Both Defendant's and Plaintiff Zuvich, Dowd and Young's Motion for Summary Judgment for June 4, 2012; or for Continuance ("Application"). Having reviewed the parties' submissions, the court DENIES the Application in part, GRANTS the Application in part, and adopts the following Order.

First, the court denies Plaintiffs' request to strike Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment. As Defendant explains in its Opposition, Defendant adequately complied with the relevant document filing and meet and confer requirements for its Motion, as set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Central District

1 Local Rules, and Magistrate Judge's Case Management Order.

2 Second, the court denies Plaintiffs' request to "restore[]" to  
3 calendar" their previously filed Motions for Summary Judgment.  
4 Plaintiffs, then appearing in pro per, erroneously filed their  
5 Motions to be heard by this court, instead of by the Magistrate  
6 Judge. The Magistrate Judge therefore took the Motions off  
7 calendar. Plaintiffs, now represented by counsel, may re-file for  
8 summary judgment before the court, if they wish to do so.

9 Third, the Magistrate Judge has already issued an Order  
10 allowing Plaintiffs to file an expanded opposition to Defendant's  
11 Motion for Summary Judgment, not to exceed thirty-five (35) pages.  
12 The Order remains in effect.

13 Last, to accommodate Plaintiffs' counsel, the court grants  
14 Plaintiffs' request to continue the hearing on Defendant's Motion  
15 for Summary Judgment from May 21, 2012 to June 4, 2012 at 10:00  
16 a.m.


17 In sum, the court DENIES Plaintiffs' request to strike  
18 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, DENIES Plaintiffs' request  
19 to restore to calendar their Motions for Summary Judgment, and  
20 GRANTS Plaintiffs' request to continue the hearing on Defendant's  
21 Motion for Summary Judgment to June 4, 2012. In accord with the  
22 Magistrate Judge's Order, Plaintiffs may also file an expanded  
23 opposition to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, not to  
24 exceed thirty-five (35) pages.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26

27 Dated: May 9, 2012

28

  
DEAN D. PREGERSON  
United States District Judge