

Plaintiff Sara McEnroe filed this action on August 16, 2012, in Sonoma County Superior Court, against Defendants Local 9400, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO; District 9, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO; and Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO. Dkt. No. 1. Defendants removed the case to this Court on July 30, 2014. *Id.* In the operative complaint, filed on August 27, 2014, Plaintiff alleges a single cause of action for breach of the duty of fair representation as to Plaintiff's unlawful termination grievance, which is a "hybrid" claim under § 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act ("LMRA"). Dkt. No. 11.

20 Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on October 7, 2015. Dkt. No. 41. A hearing on the motion was held on November 12, 2015, at which Plaintiff represented that 21 22 additional discovery taken since she filed the opposition to the motion for summary judgment 23 demonstrates a genuine dispute of material fact. While the Court doubts that Plaintiff has made 24 the required showing under Rule 56(d) that "for specified reasons, [she] cannot present facts 25 essential to justify [her] opposition," the Court finds in an abundance of caution that supplemental briefing regarding the additional discovery is warranted to ensure that a decision on the motion for 26 27 summary judgment is made on the basis of a complete evidentiary record.

United States District Court Northern District of California

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

28

Accordingly, Plaintiff is ordered to file a supplemental brief of no more than ten pages,

United States District Court Northern District of California

clearly setting out those new facts discovered after the opposition was filed that bear on (1) when
the alleged breach of the duty of fair representation occurred; (2) what constituted the alleged
breach of the duty of fair representation; and (3) why there is a genuine dispute of material fact
regarding whether Defendants breached the duty of fair representation. Plaintiff shall file the
supplemental brief by November 30, 2015. Defendants need not file a responsive supplemental
brief unless the Court so orders following its review of Plaintiff's filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 13, 2015

Haywood S. Sull

HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR. United States District Judge