1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	SANDRIKA MEDLOCK, et al.,	Case No. 1:07-cv-01314-SAB
11	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR ORDER EXTENDING 10-PAGE LIMIT FOR PLAINTIFFS' REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTIONS IN
12	V.	
13	TACO BELL CORP., et al.,	LIMINE
14	Defendants.	(ECF No. 599)
15	The Court has read and considered Plaintiffs' motion to extend the page limit for	
16	Plaintiffs' reply brief. Considering the issues to be addressed and the extent of Plaintiffs'	
	original briefing, the Court finds that ten pages is sufficient for Plaintiffs to reply to Defendants'	
18 19	opposition. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' request for an extension of the reply page limit is HEREBY	
20	DENIED.	in extension of the repry page mint is marched r
20		
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	SIR
23	Dated: January 27, 2016	Jung N. Lace
24		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25		
26		
27		
28		
	1	