

1 NIELSEN MERKSAMER
 2 PARRINELLO GROSS & LEONI LLP
 3 JAMES R. PARRINELLO, ESQ. (S.B. NO. 63415)
 4 CHRISTOPHER E. SKINNELL, ESQ. (S.B. NO. 227093)
 5 2350 Kerner Boulevard, Suite 250
 6 San Rafael, California 94901
 7 Telephone: (415) 389-6800
 8 Facsimile: (415) 388-6874

9 NIELSEN MERKSAMER
 10 PARRINELLO GROSS & LEONI LLP
 11 CATHY A. CHRISTIAN, ESQ. (S.B. NO. 83196)
 12 1415 L Street, Suite 1200
 13 Sacramento, California 95814
 14 Telephone: (916) 446-6752
 15 Facsimile: (916) 446-6106

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
 17 COUNTY OF AMADOR, CALIFORNIA

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

20 COUNTY OF AMADOR, CALIFORNIA,)
 21 *Plaintiff,*)
 22 vs.)
 23 THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT)
 24 OF THE INTERIOR; S.M.R. JEWELL,)
 25 Secretary of the United States Department)
 26 of Interior; KEVIN WASHBURN,)
 27 Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs,)
 28 United States Department of Interior,)
)
) *Defendants.*)
)
) THE IONE BAND OF MIWOK INDIANS,)
)
) *Intervenor Defendant*)

Case No. 2:12-cv-01710-TLN-CKD

**AMADOR COUNTY'S
 STIPULATED APPLICATION
 TO FILE 50-PAGE COMBINED
 BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS
 MOTION FOR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT AND IN
 OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANTS' AND
 INTERVENER-DEFENDANT'S
 MOTIONS; ORDER**

DATE: November 6, 2014
 TIME: 2:00 p.m.
 JUDGE: Hon. Troy L. Nunley
 (Courtroom No. 2)

1 On September 4, 2014, Plaintiff County of Amador is due to file a brief combining its (1)
2 reply in favor of its motion for summary judgment, filed May 1, 2014, and (2) its oppositions to the
3 respective motions for summary judgment of Defendants and Intervener-Defendant. *See* Amended
4 Pretrial Scheduling Order (Dkt. #62), ¶ V.3; Order Granting Extensions of Time (Dkt. #79), p. 4.

5 The County, by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby seeks permission from this
6 Court to file a combined reply/opposition not to exceed 50 pages.

7 Good cause exists because the Court, in its Amended Pretrial Scheduling Order, provided
8 that “[e]ach party’s combined briefs shall not exceed a total of 70 pages.” However, that limit puts
9 the County at a disadvantage relative to the other parties because the County—unlike Defendants
10 and Intervener-Defendant—will be responding to two motions/oppositions, instead of only one.

11 The County’s initial moving papers were 41 pages long,¹ leaving it only 29 pages for a
12 combined opposition/reply to both motions, which the County expects will be substantial, given the
13 important issues raised by this action. The requested 50 pages basically equates to 20 pages in
14 opposition to each of the anticipated motions, and a ten-page reply brief in support the County’s
15 own motion for summary judgment. That is consistent with this Court’s normal page limits,
16 contained in its standing order.

17 *Counsel for Defendants and Intervener-Defendant have stated, on behalf of their clients,*
18 *that they do not oppose this application.*

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 Dated: July 2, 2014

21 NIELSEN MERKSAMER
22 PARRINELLO GROSS & LEONI LLP

23 By: /s/ Christopher E. Skinnell

24 James R. Parrinello

25 Cathy A. Christian

26 Christopher E. Skinnell

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

28 AMADOR COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

28 ¹ *See* Amador County’s Notice of Motion & Motion for Summary Judgment; Memorandum
of Points & Authorities In Support Of Same (Dkt. #65).

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


ORDER

Upon consideration of the Amador County’s Stipulated Application to File 50-Page Combined Brief in Support of Its Motion For Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Defendants’ and Intervener-Defendant’s Motions (Dkt. #80), and good cause having been shown, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Application is GRANTED. The County of Amador may file a combined Summary Judgment Opposition and Reply, presently due on September 4, 2014, not to exceed 50 pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 3, 2014



Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge