EX PARTE MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING AND REPLY Case No. CV-13-3664-CRB

Bank of New York Mellon v. City of Richmond, California et al

Doc. 5

## EX PARTE MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING AND REPLY BRIEF ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR RULE 11 SANCTIONS

Pursuant to Local Rule 6-3, Defendants hereby move this Court for an *ex parte* order continuing the hearing and reply brief on Defendants' Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions. Plaintiffs oppose this motion. Declaration of Eric Brown ¶10.

This Court dismissed the instant case on November 6, 2013, on the ground that the case was not ripe under Article III. Doc. 53. Defendants have moved for Rule 11 attorneys' fees sanctions against Plaintiffs in connection with Plaintiffs' refusal to voluntarily withdraw their complaint after this Court dismissed the related case *Wells Fargo v. Richmond*, Case No. 13-3663-CRB, on ripeness grounds that presented no basis for distinguishing the instant case. Doc. 55. Defendants noticed the hearing on their motion for December 13, 2013. *Id.* This Court subsequently continued the hearing sua sponte to December 20, 2013, Doc. 56, and under the current briefing schedule Plaintiffs' opposition to the motion is due on November 22, 2013, and Defendants' reply is due on December 2, 2013.

For the reasons explained in the accompanying Declaration of Eric Brown, both the new hearing date and the date that the reply brief is currently due pose significant problems for Defendants. Most importantly, all three of the partners at Altshuler Berzon LLP who are counsel in this case are also lead counsel for Respondent SEIU Healthcare Illinois and Indiana in *Harris v. Quinn*, Dkt. No. 11-681, before the United States Supreme Court. Brown Decl. ¶4. *Harris* is on a very tight schedule, as the Supreme Court granted certiorari in October and set argument for January 21, 2014. The Petitioners' brief in *Harris* is due on November 22, 2013, and the Respondents' brief, for which Scott Kronland has principal responsibility, but on which Mr. Berzon and Ms. Leyton are also working, is due on December 23, 2013. *Id.* Substantial work, including preparing, editing, and finalizing the brief and coordinating with several amici, will be required of all three partners during the interim period, and especially in the week before Respondents' brief is due.

In addition, all of the Altshuler Berzon LLP attorneys who are counsel in this case have other commitments (some of which arose after Defendants' Rule 11 Motion was filed) that will

1	adversely affect their ability to meet the current December 2, 2013 due date for the reply brief.		
2	Since the motion was filed, Stephen Berzon had to take on responsibility for preparing and arguing		
3	United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646 v. Abercrombie, Case No. SCWC 12-0000505, befo		
4	the Hawaii Supreme Court on December 5, 2013, which will require the majority of his time		
5	between now and then. Brown Decl. ¶6. Stacey Leyton has a major motion to dismiss due on		
6	November 25, 2013, in Salas v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Case No. 12-cv-		
7	10506 (C.D. Cal), a complex breach of fiduciary duty case involving a 119-page complaint (plus		
8	over 100 pages of exhibits). Brown Decl. ¶7. Ms. Leyton also will be filing attorneys' fees		
9	petitions in early December in two significant voting rights cases, <i>NEOCH v. Husted</i> , Case No.		
10	2:06-cv-00896 (S.D. Ohio), and Service Employees International Union, Local 1 v. Husted, Case		
11	No. 12-cv-00562 (S.D. Ohio), successfully litigated in the Sixth Circuit. Brown Decl. ¶7. Eric		
12	Brown has a reply brief due in Carrillo v. Schneider Logistics, Case No: 11-cv-8557 (C.D. Cal.), a		
13	case involving the mistreatment of warehouse workers on several grounds, on December 2, 2013,		
14	the same day that the reply brief on Defendant's Rule 11 Motion in this case is currently due.		
15	Brown Decl. ¶8. Additionally, Mr. Brown has a merits opposition brief in <i>Turtle Bay Exploration</i>		
16	Park v. Baker, Case No. 176864 (Cal. Superior Ct.), due on December 4, 2013, as well as a three-		
17	day arbitration before an administrative law judge of the California Public Employees' Relations		
18	Board scheduled for December 16, 17, and 18, which will require a significant amount of time to		
19	prepare between now and then. Brown Decl. ¶8. Mr. Brown also has a petition pending before the		
20	California Supreme Court in <i>United Teachers Los Angeles v. Superior Court</i> , Court of Appeal Case		
21	No. B251693, which will require a reply and substantial work in the coming weeks should it be		
22	granted. Brown Decl. ¶8. Finally, the Altshuler Berzon LLP attorneys have family commitments,		
23	some involving pre-paid travel, and some involving visits by out of town children and		
24	grandchildren over the week of the Thanksgiving holiday, which is the week before the reply brief		
25	is currently scheduled to be due.		
26	Because there is no urgent reason why Defendants' Rule 11 motion for attorneys' fees		

- 1			
1	20, 2013, and that the hearing date be continued to January 24, 2013. (Defendants also have no		
2	objection to continuing Plaintiffs' opposition brief to December 6, 2013.) Should the January 24,		
3	2013 hearing date be unavailable, Defendants ask that the Court set another hearing date in Januar		
4	or February that it deems appropriate.		
5	The only two previous time modifications in this case were to allow Defendants to delay		
6	responding to the Complaint until after the Court ruled on the pending motion to dismiss in the		
7	Wells Fargo case, Doc. 23, and this Court's recent sua sponte continuance of the hearing on		
8	Defendants' Rule 11 motion, Doc. 56.		
9	For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant Defendants' motion to continue the		
0	hearing date and briefing schedule.		
1	Dated: November 18, 2013	Respectfully submitted,	
12		/s/ Stacey M. Leyton	
13		Stacey M. Leyton	
4		Stephen P. Berzon	
15		Scott A. Kronland Stacey M. Leyton	
16		Eric P. Brown Altshuler Berzon LLP	
17			
18		Attorneys for Defendants  City of Richmond, Richmond City Council,	
19		Mortgage Resolution Partners LLC, and Gordian	
		Sword LLC	
20		Bruce Reed Goodmiller Carlos A. Privat	
21		City of Richmond	
22		Attorneys for Defendants City of Richmond and	
23		Richmond City Council	
24		William A. Falik	
25		Attorney for Defendants	
26		Mortgage Resolution Partners LLC and Gordian Sword LLC	
27			
28			
- 1			