

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS HAUSCHILD,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 15-01556 WHA

v.

CITY OF RICHMOND, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

**ORDER RE TRIAL BRIEFS**

By **TOMORROW AT NOON**, counsel for the City of Richmond shall please advise the Court whether pages 3 and 4 of the City’s amended trial brief are mistaken in stating, “Because Hauschild was notified of intended discipline action on September 24, 2013, the discipline could not have been based on incidents earlier than approximately September 20, 2013,” and, “Only Charge One against Hauschild involved any consideration of events that occurred before September 20, 2013.” Counsel shall please also explain the basis for the claim on page 3 that “The statute of limitations is tolled by a minimum of five days,” and advise the Court as to any other errors in the City’s pretrial filings (Dkt. No. 138 (emphasis added)).


Also by **TOMORROW AT NOON**, counsel for plaintiff Thomas Hauschild shall please submit a written response, not to exceed **THREE PAGES** in length, addressing the City’s contention that Section 13701(b) of the California Penal Code required Lt. Albert Walle to consider “the history of domestic violence between the persons involved” in “identifying the

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

dominant aggressor” when investigating the domestic violence incident that occurred on  
September 23, 2012 (*see id.* at 1–2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 13, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE