

1 JOHN L. BURRIS, STATE BAR NO. 69888
 Law Offices of John L. Burris
 2 Airport Corporate Centre
 3 7677 Oakport Road, Suite 1120
 Oakland, California 94621
 4 Telephone: 510.839.5200
 Facsimile: 510.839.3882
 5

6 JAMES B. CHANIN, STATE BAR NO. 76043
 7 JULIE M. HOUK, STATE BAR NO. 114968
 Law Offices of James B. Chanin
 8 3050 Shattuck Avenue
 Berkeley, California 94705
 9 Telephone: 510.848.4752
 10 Facsimile: 510.848.5819

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 12
 13

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16

17 DELPHINE ALLEN; et al;

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.
 20

21 CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
 22

23 Defendants.
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

MASTER CASE NO. C-00-4599 TEH

**PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO ENLARGE PAGE LIMIT ON
 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN
 SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
 APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER;
 DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFFS'
 COUNSEL IN SUPPORT THEREOF AND
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

**Hearing Date: December 13, 2012
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Courtroom: 2, 17th Floor
 The Honorable Thelton E. Henderson**

1 **PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION AND**
2 **DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL**

3 I, JULIE M. HOUK, DECLARE:

4 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of California and am one of the
5 attorneys representing the Plaintiffs in the within action. I have personal knowledge of the matters
6 stated herein and would testify to the same if called to do so in Court.

7 2. Northern District Local Rule 7-3(c) and 7-4(b) require that the reply memoranda filed by
8 Plaintiffs in support of their motion for appointment of a receiver is limited to 15 pages of text,
9 absent a Court Order to the contrary. Pursuant to Rule 703(c), Plaintiffs are also required to respond
10 to evidentiary objections asserted in the oppositions filed by the City of Oakland within the reply
11 memorandum and not in a separate document.

12 3. In this case, the opposition memorandum to Plaintiffs' motion that was filed by the City of
13 Oakland was 30 pages in length. In addition, the City of Oakland violated Local Rule 7-3(c) by filing
14 a separate fifteen (15) page, single-spaced document entitled, "Defendants' Objections to Plaintiffs'
15 Evidence in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Appointment of a Receiver," instead of making their
16 objections part of their opposition memorandum. Had the City included its objections in their
17 opposition memorandum as double-spaced text, it would have clearly violated the Court's Order
18 granting its previous administrative motion to extend the page limit for their brief to fifty pages.

19 4. Plaintiffs previously sought an order enlarging the page length of their reply memorandum
20 which was denied by the Court without prejudice.

21 5. Due to the number of issues raised by the Defendant in its opposition to Plaintiffs' motion,
22 as well as the fact Plaintiffs must also respond to the fifteen page, single spaced objections to
23 Plaintiffs' evidence filed by the City of Oakland, Plaintiffs respectfully move the Court for an Order
24 enlarging the page length of Plaintiffs' reply memorandum to 30 pages of text instead of 15, to ensure
25 that Plaintiffs have sufficient space to address the issues raised by Defendant's opposition
26 memorandum in the City's improper, separate document setting forth its objections to Plaintiffs'
27 evidence.

28 6. I declare that the foregoing is true and correct under penalty of perjury. Executed this 18th

1 day of November 2012, at Dublin, New Hampshire .

2 _____/S/_____
3 Julie M. Houk
4 Attorney for Plaintiffs

5 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

6 Having considered the Administrative Motion of Plaintiffs and for good cause shown,

7 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT

