

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

VIEN DO,

Plaintiff,

v.

HOLLINS LAW P.C.,

Defendant.

No. C 13-01322 JSW

**ORDER VACATING HEARING
ON MOTION TO DISMISS;
DENYING OBJECTION TO
REPLY; AND DENYING AS
MOOT SECOND MOTION TO
APPEAR BY PHONE**

_____ /
This matter is scheduled for a hearing on July 26, 2013 to consider Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss. The Court finds the motion suitable for disposition without oral argument, and it HEREBY VACATES the hearing. *See* N.D. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). The Court shall issue a written ruling in due course. The Court also has considered Plaintiff’s objection to Defendant’s reply, and it denies the objection and denies Plaintiff’s request to strike that brief. Defendant responded to a legal argument raised by Plaintiff in the opposition, rather than presenting new evidence. Further, the Court concludes that a sur-reply is not necessary, because it does not require additional legal argument on that issue. Finally, the Court DENIES AS MOOT the motion to appear by telephone filed by Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 18, 2013



JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California