

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

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

SHEPARD JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-1968 GEB GGH PS

vs.

ORDER

CHESTER MITCHELL, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_/

Pending before the undersigned and currently set for hearing on January 31, 2013 is defendants’ motion for summary judgment (dkt. 245), plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (dkt. 258), and defendant Berrocal and Arosemena’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (dkt. 229). Plaintiff is subject to a 25 page limit on any filing he enters in this matter. Dkt. 169. The court granted plaintiff relief from and extended that limit to 35 pages for purposes of filing his opposition to and cross-motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 256. Plaintiff now seeks additional relief from the 25 page limit in responding to defendant Berrocal and Arosemena’s motion to dismiss. Dkt. 266.

Plaintiff claims that he will require approximately 35 pages in which to address the arguments raised in the motion to dismiss. Id. Although plaintiff is correct in pointing out that defendants Berrocal and Arosemena raise a total of ten arguments between them, he ignores

1 that they have done so in a motion limited to 12 pages. Dkt. 229. Plaintiff has not explained  
2 why his response to such a motion will require nearly three times as much space as the motion  
3 itself and the court cannot imagine that it will.

4 Accordingly, plaintiff's request (dkt. 266) to exceed the 25 page limit imposed by  
5 the March 2, 2012 order is HEREBY DENIED.

6 DATED: January 16, 2013

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ggh9

Johnson1968pglimitext