

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

VICTORIA URENIA, an individual; SOLEDAD CORONA, an individual,)	Case No. CV 13-01934 DDP (AJWx)
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' VARIOUS REQUESTS
)	[Dkt. Nos. 212, 216, 217]
v.)	
)	
PUBLIC STORAGE, a real estate investment trust;)	
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a governmental entity; BANK OF AMERICA, N.A.; MICHAEL ANZ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiffs have recently filed several documents with the Court. First, there is a "request" to withdraw a document that appears to have been filed in error - it is the signature page for a declaration, but the declaration itself is missing. (Dkt. No. 212 ("request to withdraw" Dkt. No. 207-2).) Apart from being procedurally irregular - a party wishing the Court to strike a document may file a noticed motion or an ex parte application - the request is unnecessary. As Plaintiffs' document notes, the entire declaration was subsequently (and timely) filed with the Court,

1 (Dkt. No. 211), and 207-2 is not likely to cause confusion.

2 Plaintiffs have also filed notices of requests under Local
3 Rule 7-8 for Defendants' declarants to appear to be examined at the
4 hearings on the parties' motions for summary judgment. (Dkt. Nos.
5 216, 217.) The rule Plaintiffs invoke, however, applies only to
6 "motions for and orders to show cause re preliminary injunctions,
7 motions to be relieved from default and other motions *where an*
8 *issue of fact is to be determined.*" Id. (emphasis added). A
9 motion for summary judgment, on the other hand, is a motion for
10 judgment as to *legal* questions based on the portions of the factual
11 record as to which there is no genuine dispute. Fed. R. Civ. P.
12 56(a). Thus, Local Rule 7-8 does not apply. Gorski v. I.R.S. of
13 U.S., No. SACV 13-00594-CJC, 2014 WL 4948625, at *1, n.2 (C.D. Cal.
14 Sept. 8, 2014); Coastal Delivery Corp. v. U.S. Customs Serv., 272
15 F. Supp. 2d 958, 961 (C.D. Cal. 2003).

16 The Court therefore DENIES the request to withdraw Dkt. No.
17 270-2 as moot and DENIES the requests to have declarants present
18 for examination, because Local Rule 7-8 does not apply to summary
19 judgment motions.

20

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22

23

24 Dated: July 16, 2015

25

26

27

28


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge