

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3
4 MONA ALLEN, et al.,
5 Plaintiffs,

6 v.

7 COUNTY OF LAKE, et al.,
8 Defendants.

Case No. 14-cv-03934-TEH

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS'
BRIEFING**

9
10 Plaintiffs in this case have demonstrated a troubling pattern of filing documents at
11 the last minute, or even minutes late, and subsequently filing “amended” or “corrected”
12 versions a day or more later, after the deadlines have passed. For example, in briefing the
13 most recent motions to dismiss, Plaintiffs first filed their opposition at midnight on January
14 8 (although it was due on January 7), and then filed a “corrected” opposition at 1:14 PM
15 later that day. Previously, Plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to amend their complaint on
16 their self-suggested deadline of October 20, 2014, and then filed an “amended motion” on
17 October 24. These are just two examples of a broader pattern of filing modified
18 documents after the deadlines have passed.

19 There is no five-second rule in the federal courts. The Court is grateful that
20 Defendants have not raised objections to these late filings, even though such filings
21 confuse matters and require additional effort in drafting a response. However, Plaintiffs
22 are hereby warned that late filings shall not be considered in the future, and will be subject
23 to monetary sanctions.

24
25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 Dated: 02/02/15



28
THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California