

United States District Court
For the 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

KARLA GOTTSCHALK,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, *et al.*,
Defendants.

No. C-12-4531 EMC

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S *EX*
PARTE REQUEST**
(Docket No. 24)

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants in this case filed a motion for a more definite statement and a motion to dismiss on September 28, 2012. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on October 17, 2012, and an opposition to the motion on October 18, 2012. In her opposition, Plaintiff requested various forms of relief, including an order sealing various records of the San Francisco Human Rights Commission (SFHRC), and declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated various statutes. Plaintiff also raised concerns that Defendants’ counsel may have a conflict of interest in representing both the City and the individual defendants.

In light of the amended complaint, Defendants withdrew their motion pursuant to Local Rule 7-7(e). Plaintiff now filed an *ex parte* request that this Court grant the relief that she requested in her opposition to Defendants’ motion. She specifically requests orders from this Court sealing various records of the SFHRC and declaratory judgment that Defendants’ counsel is conflicted out of representing any defendant other than the City and County of San Francisco.

1 As Defendants have withdrawn the September 28 motion for a more definite statement and
2 motion to dismiss following Plaintiff's amended complaint, that motion is moot.

3 To the degree that Plaintiff wishes to have this Court rule on her arguments as to why her
4 claims should not be dismissed, this Court notes that Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the
5 amended complaint on November 5, 2012. Plaintiff may thus renew her arguments in opposition to
6 that motion.

7 To the degree that Plaintiff wishes to seek some order from the Court beyond denial of
8 Defendants' motion, she cannot do so without filing a properly noticed motion under Civil Local
9 Rule 7-1 *et seq.* and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

10 For Plaintiff's benefit, the Court directs her attention to the Handbook for Pro Se Litigants,
11 which is available along with further information for the parties on the Court's website located at
12 <http://cand.uscourts.gov/proselitigants>. Ms. Gottschalk may also contact the Legal Help Center, 450
13 Golden Gate Avenue, 15th Floor, Room 2796, Telephone No. (415) 782-9000 extension 8657, for
14 free legal advice regarding her claims.


15 **II. CONCLUSION**

16 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's *ex parte* request is **DENIED**.

17 This order disposes of Docket No. 24.

18
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20
21 Dated: November 15, 2012

22 
23 _____
24 EDWARD M. CHEN
25 United States District Judge
26
27
28