

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
ROBERT E. COYLE FEDERAL COURTHOUSE

WEST PACIFIC ELECTRIC
COMPANY CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

DRAGADOS/FLATIRON, a joint
venture; LIBERTY MUTUAL
INSURANCE COMPANY, a
Massachusetts corporation;
FIDELITY AND DEPOSIT
COMPANY OF MARYLAND, a
Maryland corporation; ZURICH
AMERICAN INSURANCE
COMPANY, a New York
corporation; THE CONTINENTAL
INSURANCE COMPANY, a
Pennsylvania corporation; XL
SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY, a Delaware corporation;
THE INSURANCE COMPANY OF
THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,
a Pennsylvania corporation;
AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE
COMPANY, a New York
corporation; NATIONAL
INDEMNITY COMPANY, a
Nebraska corporation; TRAVELERS
CASUALTY AND SURETY
COMPANY OF AMERICA, a
Connecticut corporation; FEDERAL
INSURANCE COMPANY, an
Indiana corporation,

Defendants.

CASE NO: 1:18-CV-00166-LJO-BAM

ORDER REGARDING JOINT
APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
BRIEF IN EXCESS OF 25 PAGES

Assigned to:
Hon. Lawrence J. O’Neill, Courtroom 4
Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe, Courtroom 8

Complaint Filed: January 30, 2018
Trial Date: March 17, 2020

1 For good cause appearing, the parties' Joint Application for Leave to File
2 Brief in Excess of 25 Pages is hereby GRANTED pursuant to Rule 2 of the Local
3 Courtroom Rules of Judge Lawrence J. O'Neill. Defendant Dragados/Flatiron
4 Joint Venture may file a brief in support of its motion for summary judgment, or
5 in the alternative partial summary judgment, not to exceed 40 pages. Plaintiff
6 West Pacific Electric Company may file a reply brief in opposition to
7 Dragados/Flatiron Joint Venture's motion for summary judgment, or in the
8 alternative partial summary judgment, not to exceed 40 pages. However, the
9 parties are cautioned to use the extra pages to explain thoroughly the issues
10 disclosed in their Joint Application. Upon preliminary review of the filings, if the
11 Court concludes that the parties have incorporated information by reference
12 excessively or failed to explain sufficiently issues or legal arguments, the Court
13 may require re-briefing or take other appropriate action as necessary.

14 The parties are warned that due to this Court's extraordinary caseload,
15 there may be significant delays in the resolution of civil motions. The longer the
16 motion, the more likely a motion is to experience such delays. In addition, due to
17 the undersigned's planned retirement at the end of January 2020 and the strong
18 possibility that no replacement district judge will be confirmed in a timely
19 manner, civil trials set before a district judge in the Fresno Division of this
20 District are unlikely to proceed as scheduled and may be continued by many
21 months to accommodate criminal trials, which have statutory priority over civil
22 cases. The parties are strongly encouraged to reconsider magistrate judge
23 consent.

24
25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: October 15, 2019 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
27 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE