

1 ROBERT A. NAEVE (CA SBN 106095)
 RNaeve@mof.com
 2 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 1990 MacArthur Blvd.
 3 Irvine, California 92612-2445
 Telephone: 949.251.7500
 4 Facsimile: 949.251.0900

5 DAVID F. MCDOWELL (CA SBN 125806)
 SARVENAZ BAHAR (CA SBN 171556)
 6 MICHAEL J. BOSTROM (CA SBN 211778)
 DMcDowell@mof.com
 7 SBahar@mof.com
 MBostrom@mof.com
 8 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
 9 Los Angeles, California 90013-1024
 Telephone: (213) 892-5200
 10 Facsimile: (213) 892-5454

11 STUART C. PLUNKETT (CA SBN 187971)
 SPlunkett@mof.com
 12 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 425 Market Street
 13 San Francisco, CA 94105-2482
 Telephone: (415) 268-7000
 14 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522

15 Attorneys for Defendant
 TARGET CORPORATION

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

19 NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND,
 20 the NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
 OF CALIFORNIA, on behalf of their members,
 21 and Bruce F. Sexton, on behalf of himself and all
 others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 TARGET CORPORATION,

25 Defendant.

Case No. C06-01802 MHP

**DEFENDANT TARGET
 CORPORATION'S UNOPPOSED
 MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
 RELIEF TO EXCEED PAGE
 LIMITATION FOR ITS
 OPPOSITION TO NFB'S MOTION
 FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

[Local Rule 7-11]

1 On May 8, 2006, Plaintiffs National Federation of the Blind, the National Federation of
2 the Blind of California and Bruce Sexton (“NFB”) filed a motion for preliminary injunction
3 (“NFB’s Motion”) arguing that Defendant Target Corporation’s (“Target”) website violates Title
4 III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act, and California’s
5 Blind and Other Physically Disabled Persons Act. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, Target’s
6 Opposition to NFB’s Motion is limited to 25 pages.¹ Target requests relief from Local Rule 7-3
7 so that it may file and serve an Opposition brief of up to 35 pages in length. Additional pages are
8 needed for the following reasons:

9 1. NFB submitted eleven declarations in support of its Motion, including an expert
10 declaration. In light of the factual issues raised by the Motion, the parties agreed that Target
11 should be entitled to depose NFB’s witnesses before filing its Opposition Brief. Target has now
12 deposited nine of the declarants. In order to fully address the factual issues raised by this
13 testimony, as well as the legal issues raised by NFB’s federal and state claims, Target needs more
14 than the 25 pages allotted by Local Rule 7-3.

15 2. NFB’s Motion asks this Court to issue a mandatory injunction requiring Target to
16 modify its website. Thus, NFB essentially seeks a full adjudication of its claims through its
17 Motion. Target respectfully contends that it requires the additional pages to present the Court
18 with a full and complete record to decide the factual and legal issues presented by NFB’s Motion.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹ Target’s Opposition brief is due on June 12, 2006.

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

NFB has indicated that it will not oppose this Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 6, 2006

ROBERT A. NAEVE
DAVID F. MCDOWELL
STUART C. PLUNKETT
SARVENAZ BAHAR
MICHAEL J. BOSTROM
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

By: /s/
Robert A. Naeve

Attorneys for Defendant
TARGET CORPORATION