

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

LORETTA LITTLE, et al.,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
PFIZER INC, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 14-cv-01177-EMC

**RELATED TO**

Case No. [14-cv-01195-EMC](#)  
Case No. [14-cv-01196-EMC](#)  
Case No. [14-cv-01204-EMC](#)  
Case No. [14-cv-01488-EMC](#)

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES  
TO PFIZER'S RESPONSE TO ORDER  
TO SHOW CAUSE**

**(Docket No. 135)**

Previously, the Court ordered Pfizer to show cause as to why the Court should not remand the instant case and related cases back to state court. The Court also stated that Plaintiffs could file a response to Pfizer's brief.

In accordance with the above, Pfizer filed a response to the order to show cause (which McKesson joined). Plaintiffs then filed their responses to Pfizer's brief. Plaintiffs' responses simply incorporate by reference the two orders issued by Judge Carney of the Central District of California and briefs filed by Plaintiffs in conjunction with Judge Carney's cases (both at the trial and appellate level). The Court hereby strikes Plaintiffs' filings. Incorporating by reference hundreds of pages is not a true, substantive response to Pfizer's current brief. Plaintiffs have leave to file a substantive response to Pfizer's current brief within three days of the date of this order.

///  
///

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

Plaintiffs' response shall be no longer than twenty-five (25) pages. The Court strongly prefers that Plaintiffs in the above and related cases file a joint brief.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 13, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge