1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	Northern District of California
6	
7	R.K., a minor, by and through his Guardian Ad Litem, Tony Ko,
8	No. C 05-01686 MEJ Plaintiffs,
9	v. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
10	City of Hayward,
11	Defendant.
12	Pending before the Court is Defendant City of Hayward's Motion for Summary Judgment.
13	(Dkt. #64.) On July 30, 2009, the Court held a hearing on the Motion. At that time, the Court
14	ordered the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing issues relating to Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C.
<ul><li>15</li><li>16</li></ul>	§1983 claim against Defendant. The Court set the deadline for Defendant's supplemental brief for
17	August 20, 2009, and the deadline for Plaintiff's supplemental response brief for September 3, 2009.
18	On September 8, 2009, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Extension of Time, requesting that the Court
19	permit counsel to file the response brief on September 10, 2009. (Dkt. #79), which the Court
20	granted (Dkt. #80). Despite this extension, Plaintiff has not filed a supplemental response brief.
21	Accordingly, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> Plaintiff to show cause as to why no response brief has
22	been filed and why the Court should consider any brief Plaintiff intends to file at this point. If
23	Plaintiff does intend to file a response brief, it must accompany Plaintiff's response to this Order. If
24	Plaintiff does not intend to respond to Defendant's supplemental brief, Plaintiff shall indicate that in
25	its Response to this Order.
26	
27	
28	

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT For the Northern District of California

1	Plaintiff's Response to this OSC, along with any supplemental response brief, shall be due by
2	9:00 a.m. on September 15, 2009.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	$\mathcal{M}_{-}$
5	Dated: September 14, 2009
6	Maria-Eleng James Chief United States Magistrate Judge
7	emer emile a mos ranguativo e dage
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	