

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NATIONAL ABORTION FEDERATION )  
(NAF), )  
  
Plaintiff, )  
  
vs. )  
  
THE CENTER FOR MEDICAL )  
PROGRESS; BIOMAX PROCUREMENT )  
SERVICES, LLC; DAVID DALEIDEN (aka )  
"ROBERT SARKIS"); and TROY )  
NEWMAN, )

Defendants. )

) Case No. 3:15-cv-3522 (WHO)  
)  
) Judge William H. Orrick, III  
)  
) ORDER CONCERNING BRIEFING  
) AND HEARING SCHEDULE AND  
) GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION  
) FOR LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION TO  
) STRIKE AND /OR DISMISS IN  
) EXCESS OF THE PAGE LIMITS  
) INSTANTER  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

1 **ORDER**

2 Defendants The Center for Medical Progress, Biomax Procurement Services, LLC, David  
3 Daleiden, and Troy Newman (“defendants”) have filed an anti-SLAPP motion to strike and to  
4 dismiss with a sixty page brief in support, which is significantly longer than allowed by the Civil  
5 Local Rules. *See* Dkt. No. 66. Today defendants also filed a separate 25-page motion to dismiss  
6 and a 25-page motion to strike, *see* Dkt. Nos. 68-69, possibly as a precaution in case I denied the  
7 motion for excess pages. I have not had an opportunity to review any of those motions in detail.

8 In light of the various legal issues that will be argued by the parties with respect to these  
9 motions and the motion for a preliminary injunction, I am inclined to grant defendants’ motion to  
10 file their oversize brief, assuming that the motions filed today are duplicative of the earlier motions.  
11 If defendants withdraw the separate motions to dismiss (Dkt. Nos. 68-69) by August 19, 2015 at  
12 12:00 p.m., their motion to file an oversized brief is granted. Plaintiff may then file a brief of up to  
13 60 pages in opposition on or before September 8, 2015. Defendants may file a reply of not more  
14 than 20 pages by September 18, 2015.

15 If defendants seek to proceed on all of the motions filed at Dkt. Nos. 66, 68 and 69, then I  
16 will enforce the Civil Local Rules with respect to Dkt. No. 66 and deny the motion to file an  
17 oversize brief.

18 To allow a comprehensive review of the issues raised and in the interests of efficiency and  
19 the administration of justice, hearing on the motion shall occur on October 9, 2015 in conjunction  
20 with the hearing on plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction. The discovery previously  
21 ordered by the Court in connection with the preliminary injunction motion is unaffected by the  
22 filing of defendants’ motions.

23 Defendants have also filed two motions to clarify the Temporary Restraining Order. In the  
24 second, they requested a telephonic hearing. *See* Dkt. No. 61. They have yet to submit a motion  
25 for an order shortening time. The Court will address any issues relating to the scheduling of all  
26  
27  
28


1 motions at the discovery hearing on Friday, if one is requested.

2

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4

5 Dated: August 18, 2015



William H. Orrick

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28