O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AMY ROTH, SHANA EKIN, as individuals and on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHA HOLLYWOOD MEDICAL CENTER, L.P., d/b/a CHA Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center and Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center, and CHS HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT, L.L.C.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-07559-ODW (SHx)

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO REMAND [38]

On August 26, 2013, Plaintiffs Amy Roth and Shana Ekin filed their Reply in Support of Plaintiff's [*sic*] Motion to Remand. (ECF No. 38.) The Reply swells to some 24 pages—double this Court's reply page limit. FAQs about Judges' Procedures and Schedules ¶ VII(A)(1), *available at* http://court.cacd.uscourts.gov/CACD/JudgeReq.nsf/2fb080863c88ab47882567c9007fa070/d7596199bbd33e87882579f5006b0828?OpenDocument ¶ VII.A.3 ("Replies shall not exceed 12 pages.")

Plaintiffs further violate Local Rule 5-4.3.1, which provides,

> Documents filed electronically must be submitted in PDF. Except as

> provided elsewhere in this L.R. 5-4, the document filed with the Court must be created using word-processing software, then published to PDF from the original word-processing file (to permit the electronic version of the document to be searched). PDF IMAGES CREATED BY SCANNING PAPER DOCUMENTS ARE PROHIBITED . . . .

Plaintiffs' Reply appears to be either a scanned document or a nonsearchable PDF. In either case, the document does not comport with Local Rule 5-4.3.1.

Considering both of these rule violations, the Court **STRIKES** Plaintiffs' Reply (ECF No. 38) and all supporting documents (ECF Nos. 38-1–38-7). *See* L.R. 83-7(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 26, 2013



OTIS D. WRIGHT, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE