

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

RANDY BLANKENCHIP, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITIMORTGAGE, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2309 WBS AC

ORDER

Pending before the court is defendant CitiMortgage, Inc.'s June 18, 2015, Motion for Protective Order, ECF No. 21. The motion does not comply with the Local Rules of this court, and will therefore be denied without prejudice to its renewal in proper form.

Motions for protective orders are governed by E.D. Cal. R. ("Local Rule") 251, which provides:

All arguments and briefing that would otherwise be included in a memorandum of points and authorities supporting or opposing the motion shall be included in this joint statement, and no separate briefing shall be filed.


Local Rule 251(c) (emphasis added). Defendant has filed separate "arguments and briefing" in support of the motion, rather than including them in the Joint Statement, in violation of this rule. This has apparently prompted plaintiff to file his own separate brief opposing the motion. Both briefs are inappropriate and in violation of the Local Rule 251(c).

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's motion for protective order (ECF No. 21), is DENIED without prejudice to its renewal in proper form; and
2. The hearing on this motion, currently scheduled for July 29, 2015, is VACATED.

DATED: July 22, 2015



ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE