-JLT Soto, et al. v	. Castlerock Farming, et al. I	Doc. 105
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SILVESTRE SOTO and OLGA GALVAN,	) Case No.: 1:09-cv-00701 AWI JLT
12	on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated individuals,	ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO FILE AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING
13	Plaintiffs,	) AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING
14	v.	
15	CASTLEROCK FARMING AND TRANSPORT, INC., et al.,	
16	Defendants.	
17		)
18	On December 15, 2011, the Court ordered the parties to file supplemental briefing addressing	
19	(1) what effect, if any, Ms. Galvan's changed status from class representative to putative class	
20	member had on the motion to compel document production and the motion to quash, and (2)	
21	whether, the requested discovery was likely to substantiate the class claims if Plaintiff was no longer	
22	able to state a prima facie case for class certification. (Doc. 97). Further, the order set forth that the	
23	supplemental briefing was to be "no longer than 15 pages (including exhibits)" ( <i>Id.</i> at 2).	
24	On January 18, 2011, Castlerock ("Defendant") filed its supplemental brief, but failed to	
25	comply with the Court's order regarding length. (See Doc. 101). Defendant limited its argument to	
26	15 pages, but the exhibits were approximately 150 pages. Plaintiff objected to the supplemental	
27	brief, noting it violated the Court's order, and requested the document be stricken. (Doc. 103 at 2).	
28	In reply, Defendant asserted that "Castlerock misread the order, not recognizing the limitation on	
	1	

submission of exhibits." (Doc. 104 at 2). Further, Defendant asserted it "would not object to plaintiff being allowed to file an amended supplemental brief, limited to 15 pages of briefing plus any necessary exhibits . . . [to] put the parties' submissions on even footing and allow the Court to consider the issues in a full and complete context." (Id.) While the Court agrees that the parties should be on equal footing, ultimately, Defendant's proposed remedy misses the point. The proscribed 15-page limit promotes judicial economy and ensures the Court's scarce judicial resources will not be expended unnecessarily. In light of the extensive briefing already filed related to the motion to compel and the companion motion to quash, 15 pages is sufficient to analyze the current situation. Concision, of course, will be required.

Accordingly, Defendant SHALL file an amended supplemental brief within fourteen days of the date of service of this order that complies with the page limit sets forth in the Court's order dated December 15, 2011 (Doc. 97).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **January 27, 2012** 

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE