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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,
v.

SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES; et al.,
ORDER

Defendants.

Plaintiff filed a proposal regarding the format, page limits, and briefing schedule for Daubert motions and motions in limine on May 4, 2012. (ECF 460.) Defendants filed their response and counter-proposal on May 8, 2012. (ECF 462.)

Having considered the parties' proposals, and taking into account the court's inherent power to control its docket, Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc., 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal quotations, citations, and alterations omitted), the court ORDERS as follows:

1) The court will hear the parties' Daubert motions and motions in limine, to the extent required after meet and confer sessions, at the final pre-trial conference scheduled for June 14, 2012.
2) Daubert motions and motions in limine shall be filed no later than May 24, 2012. Oppositions, if any, shall be filed no later than June 7, 2012. All filings are subject to the parameters that follow. No replies shall be filed or entertained unless otherwise ordered by the court. As a general rule, the parties' brief arguments at hearing shall serve as their replies.
3) Plaintiff shall file its Daubert motions in one document consisting of an introduction that does not exceed three (3) pages, with no more than three (3) pages per motion. Defendants shall file a joint opposition, if any, consisting of an introduction that does not exceed three (3) pages, with no more than three (3) pages per opposition. The parties shall assume that the court is familiar with Daubert generally, without the need to brief the basic Daubert standard.
4) The court anticipates potential duplication among defendants’ Daubert motions. Accordingly, defendants shall file joint Daubert motions in one document consisting of an introduction that does not exceed three (3) pages, with no more than three (3) pages per motion. Plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any, consisting of an introduction that does not exceed three (3) pages, with no more than three (3) pages per opposition. Each defendant ${ }^{1}$ shall then file any remaining, separate Daubert motions in one document per defendant, omitting an introduction and allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion. Plaintiff shall file oppositions, if any, to each individual defendant's separate Daubert motions in one document, omitting an introduction and allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion opposed. Again, the parties shall assume that the

[^0]court is familiar with Daubert generally, without the need to brief the basic Daubert standard.
5) Plaintiff shall file its motions in limine in one document, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion. Defendants shall file a joint opposition, if any, in one document, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion opposed.
6) The court anticipates potential duplication among defendants' motions in limine. Accordingly, defendants shall file joint motions in limine in one document, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion. Plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any, in one document, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion opposed. Each defendant shall then file any remaining, separate motions in limine in one document per defendant, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion. Plaintiff shall file oppositions, if any, to individual defendant's motions in limine in one document, allocating no more than three (3) pages per motion opposed.
7) Each motion and opposition filed shall be particularized to this case and not merely boilerplate from counsel's store of standardized Daubert and in limine motions. Moreover, each motion and opposition shall raise only those issues that counsel in good faith determines must be raised in Dauber motions and in limine and shall not raise issues that can and should be deferred until trial.

All counsel are cautioned that failure to comply with any of the above shall result in the court's issuing an order to show cause as to why sanctions should not be imposed and an expedited show cause hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: May 11, 2012.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Howell's Forest Harvesting Co. and Eunice E. Howell are considered to be one defendant for purposes of this order. The landowner defendants are also considered to be one defendant for purposes of this order.

