

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELICIA HOLLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. C10-2603 TEH

ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEFING

This matter is set for a hearing on July 22, 2013, on Plaintiff Elicia Holland’s Motion for a New Trial and Renewed Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law. Courts in the Ninth Circuit “strictly construe the procedural requirement of filing a Rule 50(a) motion before filing a Rule 50(b) motion.” *Tortu v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Dept.*, 556 F.3d 1075, 1082 (9th Cir. 2009). On or before July 15, 2013, the parties shall file supplemental briefs, not to exceed five pages, addressing whether Holland has met the requirement of filing a Rule 50(a) motion, and if she has not, whether the Court may nevertheless consider Holland’s argument that the strip search to which she was subjected was unconstitutional as a matter of law.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/10/2013



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California