

1 redacted copy of the pending Motion for Summary Judgment by December 29, 2016, a
2 date that had passed a week beforehand. Rather than applying for an additional
3 extension to correct this discrepancy, and in order to preserve the remaining deadlines
4 set forth in the January 6, 2017 Order, the Defendant County simply filed in redacted
5 papers on January 13, 2017.

6 Plaintiff's Motion to Strike is predicated on an argument that Defendant County's
7 failure to specifically address this discrepancy, and to request an additional extension or
8 request relief from its late filing, merits dismissal of its moving papers for summary
9 judgment in their entirety.

10 Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (ECF No. 89) is DENIED.¹ Both Plaintiff and the Court
11 already had full unredacted copies of the moving papers, and Defendant County could
12 not have met a deadline that had inadvertently passed before the order authorizing it
13 was signed. Defendant County's decision to simply file the redacted copies forthwith
14 made sense and in no way justifies striking the County's moving papers as Plaintiff
15 advocates.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: September 26, 2017

18 
19 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ¹ Having determined that oral argument would not be or material assistance, the Court ordered
this Motion submitted on the briefs in accordance with E.D. Local Rule 230(g).