

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

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

LILLIE WILLIS and LAVITA OLIVER, No C-04-2305 VRW
 Plaintiffs, ORDER

v

CITY OF OAKLAND, a municipal
corporation; OAKLAND POLICE
DEPARTMENT; RICHARD WORD, in his
capacity as Chief of Police for
the CITY OF OAKLAND; CITY OF
OAKLAND Police Officers FOUGHT
and CLEMENT and DOES 6 through
10, inclusive,

 Defendants.

_____ /

On June 4, 2009, defendants moved for summary judgment on all claims. Doc #138. Because plaintiffs did not file a timely response to the summary judgment motion, the court ordered plaintiffs to show cause why defendants' motion should not be granted. Doc #141. On July 21, 2009, plaintiffs filed an opposition and attached supporting evidence. Doc #145.

Plaintiffs' opposition to defendants' motion, along with their supporting evidence, calls for a response from defendants.

1 Accordingly, defendants are hereby ORDERED to file a reply
2 memorandum in support of their motion for summary judgment not
3 later than November 3, 2009.

4
5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 

9
10 VAUGHN R WALKER
11 United States District Chief Judge