

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**UNITED STATES EQUAL  
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY  
COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

**DELFINA OCHOA, MARIBEL  
OCHOA, JOSE OCHOA, and  
GUADALUPE MARTINEZ,**

**Plaintiffs-Intervenors**

**v.**

**GIUMARRA VINEYARDS  
CORPORATION, and  
DOES 1-10,**

**Defendants.**

**1:09-cv-2255 AWI MJS**

**ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS  
TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF-  
INTERVENORS' REQUEST  
FOR RECONSIDERATION  
(DOC. NO. 80) AND ORDER  
DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION (DOC.  
NO. 81) AS REDUNDANT**

(Doc. No. 81)

On February 6, 2012, the Magistrate Judge denied Plaintiff-Intervenors' motion for discovery. See Doc. No. 78. On February 20, 2012, Plaintiff-Intervenors timely filed a request for reconsideration of that order. See Doc. No. 80; Local Rule 303(b). Per Local Rule 303(d), Defendants were required to file an opposition by February 27, 2012. Defendants did not do so. Nevertheless, the Court finds that a response from Defendants would be beneficial, and will therefore order Defendants to file either an opposition or notice of non-opposition.

Additionally, on February 29, 2012, Plaintiff-Intervenors filed a formal motion for reconsideration of the February 6 order. See Doc. No. 81. The brief for the "motion" for

1 reconsideration is identical to the brief for the “request” for reconsideration. Cf. Doc. No. 80  
2 with Doc. No. 81. Because the “motion” for reconsideration is redundant, the Court will deny  
3 that motion for administrative purposes only. The denial of the “motion” for reconsideration  
4 (Doc. No. 81) will have no effect on the Court’s resolution of “request” for reconsideration (Doc.  
5 No. 80).

6  
7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. Defendant shall file an opposition or notice of non-opposition to Plaintiff-Intervenors’  
9 request for reconsideration (Doc. No. 80) on or by March 15, 2012;<sup>1</sup> and  
10 2. Plaintiff-Intervenors’ motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 81) is DENIED as redundant.

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: March 8, 2012

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup>If the Court later determines that oral argument would be beneficial, it will set a hearing date. See Local  
28 Rule 303(e).