

1 Anne L. Keck, SBN 136315
 2 KECK LAW OFFICES
 3 418 B Street, Suite 206
 4 Santa Rosa, California 95401
 5 Telephone: (707) 595-4185
 6 Facsimile: (707) 657-7715
 7 Email: akeck@public-law.org

8 Attorneys for Defendants the
 9 County of Mendocino and
 10 Mendocino County Sheriff-
 11 Coroner Thomas Allman,
 12 Capt. Timothy Pearce, Lorrie Knapp,
 13 Frank Masterson, Craig Bernardi,
 14 Michael Grant, Jeanette Holum,
 15 Robert Page, & Christine De Los Santos

John W. Patton, Jr., *Pro Hac Vice*
 Stephen R. Niemeyer, SBN 203162
 Kathleen M. Kunkle, SBN 222800
 Kathryn R. Vaughan, *Pro Hac Vice*
 PATTON & RYAN LLC
 330 North Wabash Ave., Suite 3800
 Chicago, Illinois 60611
 Telephone: (312) 261-5160
 Facsimile: (312) 261-5161
 Emails: jpatton@pattonryan.com
 sniemeyer@pattonryan.com
 kkunkle@pattonryan.com
 kvaughan@pattonryan.com

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 JAMES NEUROTH, *et al.*,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 MENDOCINO COUNTY, *et al.*,

17 Defendants.

Case No. 3:15-CV-03226-RS

**STIPULATION FOR ORDER TO
 EXTEND THE PAGE LIMIT FOR
 COUNTY DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
 SUPPORT OF THEIR SUMMARY
 JUDGMENT MOTION, AND
 WITHDRAWAL OF RELATED
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION;
 [PROPOSED] ORDER**

18
 19 This Stipulation is submitted on behalf of Plaintiff James Neuroth ("Plaintiff") and
 20 Defendants the County of Mendocino, Mendocino County Sheriff Thomas Allman, Sheriff's Captain
 21 Timothy Pearce, and current/former Sheriff's Deputies Lorrie Knapp, Frank Masterson, Craig
 22 Bernardi, Michael Grant, Jeanette Holum, Robert Page, and Christine De Los Santos (collectively,
 23 "County Defendants"). Through this Stipulation, County Defendants request the Court to enter an
 24 order extending the page limit for their Reply brief in support of their Motion for Summary
 25 Judgment by 5 pages, from the 15 pages as allowed under Local Rule 7-4(b) to a total of 20 pages.
 26 Plaintiff has no objection to this request, and the parties believe that good cause supports the
 27 requested order, as set forth below.

28 ///

1 **RECITALS**

2 A. On May 24, 2018, County Defendants filed their Motion for Summary Judgment
3 [Dkt. No. 265] on behalf of ten separate defendants, seeking summary judgment on seven causes of
4 action (including about seventeen different sub-claims) Plaintiff asserted against them in his Fourth
5 Amended Complaint. Pursuant to this Court’s order of May 7, 2018 [Dkt. No. 253], the
6 memorandum of points and authorities in support of that motion was 35 pages long.

7 B. On July 5, 2018, Plaintiff filed his combined Opposition to all motions for summary
8 judgment, including County Defendants’, under seal and in connection with his Administrative
9 Motion to File Documents Under Seal, *et al.* (Dkt. No. 304.) Also pursuant to this Court’s order of
10 May 7, 2018 [Dkt. No. 253], the memorandum of points and authorities in support of Plaintiff’s
11 Opposition was 80 pages long.

12 C. County Defendants’ Reply in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment is due
13 to be filed on July 19, 2018. (*See* Dkt. No. 249.) County Defendants have informed Plaintiff that,
14 given the sheer number of issues and the volumes of arguments Plaintiff submitted in his Opposition,
15 County Defendants have determined that they need an extension of their Reply brief to 20 pages to
16 adequately respond. Specifically, County Defendants believe that the normal 15-page limit simply
17 does not provide them with sufficient space to explain their arguments and evidentiary objections,
18 and conforming to that limit will prevent them from fully presenting the necessary issues to the
19 Court. County Defendants submit that while a 20-page Reply brief will still be a tight fit for all of
20 the issues they must address therein, they will work to ensure arguments are clear and succinct.

21 D. On July 13, 2018, County Defendants filed a Motion for Administrative Relief
22 requesting the 20-page extension for their Reply brief. (Dkt. No. 320.) In light of Plaintiff’s
23 agreement to stipulate to that relief, County Defendants hereby withdraw that Administrative
24 Motion.

25 Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff and County Defendants, through their respective counsel,
26 stipulate and agree as follows:

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

AGREEMENT

1. The parties request entry of an order extending the page limit for County Defendants' Reply brief in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment to 20 pages.

2. In light of this stipulation, County Defendants withdraw their Motion for Administrative Relief to Extend Page Limit of Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Summary judgment. (Dkt. No. 320.)

3. Nothing in this Stipulation and request for order is intended to modify the other matters addressed in any Court order unless expressly identified herein, nor does it preclude the parties from seeking additional relief from this Court.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Keck Law Offices

Dated: July 13, 2018

By: /s/ Anne L. Keck
Anne L. Keck
Attorneys for County Defendants

Haddad & Sherwin LLP

Dated: July 13, 2018

By: /s/ Michael J. Haddad
Michael J. Haddad
Attorneys for Plaintiff

* Approval in the filing of this document has been obtained from all signatories.

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

ORDER

The parties' foregoing stipulation is approved, and with good cause appearing therefor,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. The page limit for County Defendants' Reply brief in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment shall be extended to 20 pages.
2. County Defendants' Motion for Administrative Relief to Extend Page Limit of Reply Brief in Support of Motion for Summary judgment [Dkt. No. 320] is hereby deemed withdrawn.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 7/16/18



HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG
United States District Court Judge