1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	
8	JAMSHID S. KASHANNEJAD, No. C-11-2228 EMC
9	Plaintiff,
10	v. ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION FROM PLAINTIFF
11	UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES, et al.,(Docket Nos. 98-101)
12	Defendants.
13	/
14	
15	Plaintiff has submitted a statement questioning whether Defendants have complied with the
16	Court's prior orders. See, e.g., Docket No. 88, 94 (orders). Defendants have submitted a
17	declaration, indicated that they have complied with the orders. Having reviewed the papers
18	submitted, the Court hereby orders Plaintiff to provide a supplemental declaration. In the
19	supplemental declaration, Plaintiff must state:
20	(1) What the entire contents of the package were. This should include a clarification as
21	to whether the package included two envelopes or three envelopes.
22	(2) Assuming that he received only two envelopes (one for him and one for the carrier),
23	whether he would prefer a new transportation letter to CBP to be mailed to him or whether he would
24	prefer to pick up a new letter in Dubai.
25	To the extent Plaintiff suggests that the transportation letter to the <i>carrier</i> must include
26	attachments (i.e., one of the Court's prior orders and the Mulraney declaration), the Court does not
27	agree that such is necessary. The attachments are needed only with respect to the transportation
28	letter to CBP, not the carrier.

To the extent Plaintiff, in his reply brief, presents evidence that the transportation letter will not be accepted by a carrier, the Court finds the argument unpersuasive. Plaintiff has not provided any evidence that the transportation letter for the *carrier* – as opposed to the courtesy copy that the Court ordered be provided to him - is inadequate. The Court specifically allowed Defendants to include markings on the courtesy copy to indicate that it is not an official document. See Docket No. 88 (Order at 2).

Plaintiff shall file his supplemental declaration within three court days from the date of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 19, 2012

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge

United States District Court For the Northern District of California