

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAUREN MATHEIN and CHRISTINE
SABAS, on behalf of themselves and all
other individuals similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

PIER 1 IMPORTS, INC.; PIER 1
IMPORTS (U.S.); and DOES 1 to 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 1:16-cv-00087-DAD-SAB

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION
TO EXTEND PAGE LIMITATION FOR
THEIR OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR,
IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY
ADJUDICATION

(Doc. No. 28)

Before the court is an application to extend page limitation for opposition to defendants’
motion for summary judgment, or in the alternative summary adjudication. (Doc. No. 28.)
Finding good cause, the court grants relief from the page limitation with respect to the opposition
and reply briefs. Accordingly,

1. Plaintiffs Lauren Mathein and Christine Sabas may file an opposition brief to defendants’
motion for summary judgment not exceeding thirty-five (35) pages;

////


////

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

2. In response to plaintiffs, defendants Pier 1 Imports, Pier 1 Imports (U.S.), and Does 1 to 100, may file a reply brief not exceeding twenty (20) pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 27, 2017


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE