

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAANTHONY BOOKHAMER,
Plaintiff(s),
v.
SUNBEAM PRODUCTS INC.,
Defendant(s).

No. C 09-06027 DMR

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFFS' LETTER OF
OCTOBER 5, 2012 [DOCKET NO. 85]**

Before the court is Plaintiffs' request to submit a reply letter in response to the letter that Defendant appended to court-ordered document submissions. [Docket No. 85.] The court notes that the September 27, 2012 order which asked for the submissions stated the following:

Defendant shall submit (1) the Oklahoma state and family court records that Defendant believes impeach Mary DiSilvestro's deposition testimony that she lacked knowledge of Victoria DiSilvestro's drug use and neglect of her children, and (2) the specific portions of Mary DiSilvestro's deposition testimony in which she asserts this lack of knowledge; and Plaintiffs shall submit the specific portions of the deposition testimony of Anthony Bookhamer's and Carl DiSilvestro's fathers which Plaintiffs contend obviate Defendant's need to redepose Mary DiSilvestro.

[Docket No. 80.] The court granted neither party permission to submit an accompanying letter. Nevertheless, Defendant submitted a letter containing approximately one page of argumentation and eleven pages which highlight portions of the submissions for the court's attention. Plaintiffs submitted a letter containing over a page of argumentation. The court therefore permits Plaintiffs to file by October 12, 2012 a letter comparable to Defendant's,

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

which contains only descriptive – and not argumentative – information about Plaintiffs' submissions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 9, 2012

