

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JULIE SU,
Plaintiff,
v.
SIEMENS INDUSTRY, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 12-cv-03743-JST

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SHORTEN TIME; ORDERING
PLAINTIFF TO RE-NOTICE HEARING**

Re: ECF No. 129

Plaintiff’s motion for an order shortening time is DENIED. Neither Defendant nor Intervenor Anderson has stipulated to the change of time, and Plaintiff has failed to identify any “substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court did not change the time.” Civ. L.R. 6-3(a)(3).

Plaintiff is seeking to have her May 27 motion for clarification heard concurrently with her May 20 motion for interlocutory appeal. That approach may have benefits, but it does not justify shortening the time Defendant and Intervenor would have to file any responses to the newly filed May 27 motion, or the time the Court would have to consider these filings. Plaintiff is free to seek a stipulation, or failing that, an order, continuing the hearing date and briefing schedule on the May 20 motion so that the motions can be heard concurrently. Alternatively, Plaintiff could seek to have the Court’s order on the first motion for interlocutory appeal stayed until such time as the Court rules on the May 27 motion.

///
///
///
///
///

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

Unless and until the Court grants an order shortening time, all motions must be noticed for hearing “not less than 35 days after service of the motion.” Civ. L.R. 7-2(a). Therefore, Plaintiff is ORDERED to re-notice its May 27 motion for hearing in compliance with the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 2, 2014



JON S. TIGAR
United States District Judge