1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 GAMESTOP, INC., No. 2:17-cv-00719-TLN-KJN 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR PERMISSION FOR ELECTRONIC CASE FILING OF AMICUS BRIEF 14 STEPHANIE A. BRIDGETT, District Attorney, Shasta County District 15 Attorney's Office, in her official capacity and MICHAEL HESTRIN, District 16 Attorney, Riverside County District Attorney's Office, in his official capacity, 17 18 Defendants. 19 This matter is before the Court pursuant to individual Richard Hopp's ("Hopp") motion 20 for permission to participate in electronic case filing as an amicus curie. (ECF No. 23.) 21 Hopp's motion is a scant two-page document in which he states that he wishes to 22 participate in electronic case filing as an amicus curie. (ECF No. 23 at 1.) He adds that he agrees 23 to abide by the requirements of the electronic filing system, and that he has the necessary 24 equipment, such as a computer with internet access, a printer, a scanner, and word-processing and 25 pdf convert software. (ECF No. 23 at 1–2.) 26 There is no inherent right to file an amicus curiae brief with the Court. "The district court 27 has broad discretion to appoint amici curie." *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 28 1

1982). Courts may find amicus briefs from nonparties useful if the amicus has a unique perspective or information or the brief concerns legal issues that have ramifications beyond the parties. Safari Club Int'l v. Harris, No. 2:14-CV-01856-GEB-AC, 2015 WL 1255491, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2015). "An amicus curiae brief which brings relevant matter to the attention of the Court that has not already been brought to its attention by the parties is of considerable help to the Court. An amicus curiae brief which does not serve this purpose simply burdens the staff and facilities of the Court and its filing is not favored." Fed. R. App. P. 29 Advisory Comm.'s Note (b).

Hopp has not provided his proposed brief to the Court. He has not explained what filing or aspect of the case he wishes to address and has not discussed why his participation would be helpful to the Court. Hopp has not provided the Court with any information that would allow the Court to grant him permission to electronically file briefs to participate in this matter.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court hereby DENIES Hopp's motion for permission for electronic case filing (ECF No. 23).

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 11, 2017