

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

MORGAN HILL CONCERNED
PARENTS ASSOCIATION, an
unincorporated association, and
CONCERNED PARENTS
ASSOCIATION, an unincorporated
association,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION and DOES 1 through 5,

Defendants.

No. 2:11-cv-03471-KJM-AC

ORDER

Defendants have filed a request for reconsideration of this court’s April 19, 2017 amended order, ECF No. 302, and the magistrate judge’s April 18, 2017 amended order, ECF No. 299, approving the Special Master’s recommended apportionment of his reasonable expenses set forth in two invoices dated February 3, 2017 and requiring defendants to forward specified amounts to the Clerk of the Court for payment to the Special Master. Defendants seek reconsideration on the ground that the court did not consider their timely objections to the invoices and the recommended apportionment.

////

1 The Special Master submitted two invoices: one for expenses he recommended be
2 paid by plaintiffs and one for expenses he recommended be paid by defendants. Plaintiffs have
3 paid their recommended apportionment. In accordance with this court's January 25, 2016 order,
4 the matter of payment for services rendered by the Special Master between November 10, 2015
5 and December 22, 2015 is for this court, while the matter of payment for all subsequent services
6 by the Special Master is for the magistrate judge. ECF No. 149 at 3. The Special Master
7 tendered one invoice for recommended payment by defendants, which covers services rendered
8 between November 11, 2015 and December 19, 2016. Similarly, defendants submitted one set of
9 objections directed at the entire invoice rather than the two periods described in the January 25,
10 2016 order.

11 Defendants raise four objections to the invoice submitted by the Special Master
12 and the recommended apportionment of expenses contained therein. Some of the objections are
13 properly raised only, if at all, as to services rendered after December 22, 2015. Defendants must
14 focus their objections on the two periods identified in the January 25, 2016 order; that is, they
15 must raise before this court objections, if any they have, to the recommended apportionment of
16 expenses for the period between November 10, 2015 and December 22, 2015, and to the
17 magistrate judge separate objections, if any they have, to the recommended apportionment of
18 expenses for services rendered after December 22, 2015.

19 Good cause appearing, defendants will be granted a period of fourteen days from
20 the date of this order to file, as appropriate, separate requests for reconsideration before this court
21 and before the magistrate judge that are properly focused in accordance with this order.
22 Defendants' April 19, 2017 motion for reconsideration will be denied without prejudice.

23 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants' April
24 19, 2017 request for reconsideration, ECF No. 303, is denied without prejudice to its renewal, as
25 appropriate, in accordance with the provisions of this order.

26 DATED: May 11, 2017.

27 
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE