1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JONATHAN CODY, No. 1:14-cv-01239-DAD-BAM (PC) 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' **MOTION TO STRIKE** 14 JEFFREY BEARD, et al., (Doc. No. 36) 15 Defendants. 16 17 On February 19, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge issued a findings and 18 recommendations recommending that the court grant defendants' motion for partial summary 19 judgment. (Doc. No. 25.) On March 17, 2016, plaintiff filed objections to the findings and 20 recommendation. (Doc. No. 27.) On March 28, 2016, defendants filed a response to plaintiff's 21 objections. (Doc. No. 28.) Plaintiff then filed a surreply on April 25, 2016. (Doc. No. 34.) 22 Currently before the court is defendants' motion to strike plaintiff's surreply. (Doc. No. 36.) Defendants argue that plaintiff's filing of a surreply violates Local Rule 304, which provides 23 24 for objections to finding and recommendations and a response to those objections, but does not authorize the filing of a surreply. Furthermore, defendants note that the court did not request 25 26 leave to file a surreply, nor did the court grant such leave. 27 Defendants are correct that neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the Local 28 Rules contemplate or authorize the filing of a surreply. Also, in this case the court did not

request, nor did plaintiff seek leave to file his unauthorized surreply. Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the court has exercised its discretion and considered plaintiff's surreply in determining whether to adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. However, the court found that nothing in plaintiff's submissions, including his surreply, that undermined the magistrate judge's analysis, and the findings and recommendations in question were adopted in full. (Doc. No. 37.) For the reasons set forth above, defendants' motion to strike (Doc. No. 36) is denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dale A. Dragd Dated: May 13, 2016