

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 HARTFORD CASUALTY
12 INSURANCE COMPANY,

CASE NO. CV F 09-0914 LJO SKO

13 vs.

**ORDER REGARDING ERRATA
DOCUMENTS AND REPLY BRIEFING**
(Doc. 145.)

14 AMERICAN DAIRY FOOD
15 CONSULTING LABORATORIES,
INC.

16 Defendant.
17 _____/

18 AND RELATED COUNTER ACTION.
19 _____/
20

21 This Court has reviewed the parties' voluminous summary judgment moving and opposition
22 papers. This Court will not review Hartford's errata documents given this Court's devotion of inordinate
23 time to review the parties' verbose, tedious papers and Hartfords' inexplicable failure to properly file
24 papers.

25 This Court LIMITS Hartford's reply points and authorities to 15 pages and DIRECTS Hartford
26 to focus on issues of Hartford's potential liability arising from Jay Helzer's conduct and imputing
27 Helzer's knowledge to Hartford.

28 IT IS SO ORDERED.

1 **Dated: April 25, 2012**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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