

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

MICHELLE LOU, MARSHA BEER,  
SIMON NIM, and JESUAN RUIZ  
RODRIGUEZ, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

No. C 12-05409 WHA

Plaintiffs,

v.

MA LABORATORIES, INC., ABRAHAM  
MA, CHRISTINE RAO, and CHRISTY  
YEE,

**ORDER PERMITTING RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
RECONSIDER THE JANUARY 8  
ORDER**


Defendants.

On February 27, the parties appeared for a status conference. In light of the unreasonable position defendants took regarding the six FLSA opt-in plaintiffs, the Court permitted plaintiffs to file a motion for reconsideration of the January 8 omnibus order regarding certification. After the parties appeared for an oral argument on plaintiffs' motion regarding the alleged settlement with the four named plaintiffs and the status of the six opt-in plaintiffs, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration (Dkt. Nos. 441, 457, 462). Our local rules state that "no response need be filed." Local Rule 7-9(d). Nevertheless, defendants are permitted to file a response (**NOT TO EXCEED TEN PAGES IN TOTAL**) by **NOON ON MARCH 24**.

Both sides should continue their trial preparation for the plaintiffs set for trial. The six opt-in plaintiffs have alleged FLSA claims and the four named plaintiffs have alleged FLSA and state-law claims.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 18, 2014.

  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California