

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 ERIC L. LIFSCHITZ,

No. C 10-2107 SI

9 Plaintiff,

ORDER RE: SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

10 v.

11 RONALD M. GEORGE,

12 Defendant.
13 _____/

14 On September 3, 2010, the Court held a hearing on defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint.
15 As discussed at the hearing, the Court finds that it would be helpful to have supplemental briefing on
16 the following two claims: (1) plaintiff's claim that California's citability and publication rules violate
17 his First Amendment right to petition the government for redress; and (2) plaintiff's claim that these
18 rules violate his right to Due Process because the 20 day time limit for requesting publication denies him
19 a meaningful opportunity to be heard in the event that the 20 day time period has lapsed by the time
20 plaintiff realizes that he wishes to request publication of a particular decision.

21 The parties shall file simultaneous supplemental briefs of no longer than 15 pages by **September**
22 **24, 2010**. If either party wishes, they may file a response of no longer than 10 pages by **October 1,**
23 **2010**. The Court will then take the motion under submission.

24
25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 Dated: September 7, 2010

28


SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge