UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREVOR WEEKS,

Plaintiff

V.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.,

Defendant

CASE NO. 1:13-CV-1641 AWI JLT

ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SECOND SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION

(Doc. No. 60)

On January 11, 2016, Defendant filed a second summary judgment motion. Hearing on the motion is set for February 29, 2016. On February 1, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion to continue or deny Defendants' motion under Rule 56(d). See Doc. No. 59. Also on February 1, 2016, Defendant filed a reply. The reply notes that Plaintiff's opposition is untimely pursuant to a scheduling order that had previously been issued by the Court. See Doc. No. 60. The reply also cites Local Rule 230(c), which provides that "[n]o party will be entitled to be heard in opposition to a motion at oral arguments if opposition has not been timely filed by that party." Defendant then argues that Plaintiff has failed to oppose the summary judgment motion and that summary judgment should be granted. See id.

The Court takes Defendant's reply essentially to be that because Plaintiff did not file a timely opposition, Local Rule 230(c) dictates that he is not entitled to oppose the motion in any way and that summary judgment should be granted. Many litigants attempt to read Local Rule

¹ On February 3, 2016, Plaintiff refiled his motion to continue or deny, but entitled the filing an opposition to summary judgment. <u>See</u> Doc. No. 61.

230(c) in this manner. However, the plain language of Rule 230(c) shows that the prohibition against "being heard in opposition" refers to being heard "at oral arguments." See Local Rule 230(c). The prohibition does not mean that a late filed written opposition will automatically be disregarded.

With this understanding of Local Rule 230(c), the Court will not grant summary judgment due to a failure to timely respond. Instead, the Court would like Defendant to file a substantive reply that addresses the arguments made in Plaintiff's opposition/motion (Doc. Nos. 59, 61).

ORDER

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant shall file a reply to Plaintiff's motion/opposition as soon as possible, but no later than 10:00 a.m. on February 12, 2016.

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE