1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	DANIEL LEVIN, ET AL., No. 3:14-cv-03352-CRB
12	Plaintiffs, ORDER RE MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION
13	V.
14	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
15	Defendant.
16	
17	The Court is in receipt of Plaintiffs' Motion for Clarification (dkt. 72) regarding this
18	Court's Argument Order (dkt. 70). As all parties are aware, the bench trial scheduled to
19	begin October 6, 2014, will address only the facial challenge to the Ordinance. Hearing
20	Trans. (dkt. 61) at 8–9. The Argument Order instructs the parties that they should come
21	prepared to discuss the legal and factual bases of the Ordinance as a regulatory taking within
22	a facial challenge (dkt. 70). See Penn Cent. Transp. Co. v. City of New York, 438 U.S. 104
23	(1978).
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.

25

26 Dated: October 3, 2014

27

28

CHARLES R. BREYER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE