

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

MASTER CASE FILE
NO. C00-4599 TEH

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
AND DENYING IN PART
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
EXPANDED PAGE LIMITS

Plaintiffs filed an administrative motion seeking to expand the page limits on their briefs in support of their motion for a receivership. They request sixty pages for their opening brief and, if Defendants' opposition exceeds twenty-five pages, twenty-five pages for their reply brief. The time for filing an opposition to or support for the motion has passed, and no responses have been filed. The Court now GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Plaintiffs' request. Plaintiffs' opening brief shall not exceed fifty pages. The Court finds it premature to consider expanding the page limit on Plaintiffs' reply brief because Defendants have not requested that their opposition brief be allowed to exceed the twenty-five-page limit.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 09/13/12



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California