

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Theodore B. Olson, SBN 38137
2 *tolson@gibsondunn.com*
Matthew D. McGill, *pro hac vice*
3 Amir C. Tayrani, SBN 229609
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
4 Telephone: (202) 955-8668, Facsimile: (202) 467-0539

5 Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., SBN 132009
tboutrous@gibsondunn.com
6 Christopher D. Dusseault, SBN 177557
Ethan D. Dettmer, SBN 196046
7 Sarah E. Piepmeier, SBN 227094
Theane Evangelis Kapur, SBN 243570
8 Enrique A. Monagas, SBN 239087
333 S. Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90071
9 Telephone: (213) 229-7804, Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

10 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
David Boies, *pro hac vice*
11 *dboies@bsflp.com*
Theodore H. Uno, SBN 248603
12 333 Main Street, Armonk, New York 10504
Telephone: (914) 749-8200, Facsimile: (914) 749-8300
13

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER,
PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J. ZARRILLO

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER,
18 PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J.
ZARRILLO,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official
capacity as Governor of California; EDMUND
22 G. BROWN, JR., in his official capacity as
Attorney General of California; MARK B.
23 HORTON, in his official capacity as Director of
the California Department of Public Health and
State Registrar of Vital Statistics; LINETTE
24 SCOTT, in her official capacity as Deputy
Director of Health Information & Strategic
25 Planning for the California Department of Public
Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official
26 capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County of
Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official
27 capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for
the County of Los Angeles,

28 Defendants.

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS' MOTION
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE TO
EXCEED PAGE LIMITATIONS**

Judge: Chief Judge Walker
Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

1 Defendant-Intervenors Dennis Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight, Martin F. Gutierrez, Hak-Shing
2 William Tam, Mark A. Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, A Project of California
3 Renewal (“Defendant-Intervenors”) moved under this Court’s Civil Local Rule 7-11 for an order
4 permitting them to file a motion for summary judgment with a 100-page long memorandum of points
5 and authorities in support. Doc #172. The motion for administrative relief is opposed by the
6 Plaintiffs. Doc #174.

7 The Court hereby orders that Defendant-Intervenors’ motion for administrative leave to
8 exceed page limitations is DENIED. Defendant-Intervenors did not obtain an order—or even seek an
9 order—permitting the filing of an over length brief prior to the deadline for filing their motion for
10 summary judgment, as is required by this Court’s Local Rules. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-2(b); 7-4(b) & 7-11.

11 In light of this fact, and the expedited schedule in this case, the Court also hereby DENIES
12 Defendant-Intervenors’ request to deem their proposed motion for summary judgment filed as of
13 September 9, 2009.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: _____

16 _____
17 The Honorable Vaughn R. Walker
18 Chief Judge of the United States District Court
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28