

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

LEGALFORCE RAPC WORLDWIDE,
P.C, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LEGALZOOM.COM, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-07194-MMC](#)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 113


Before the Court is plaintiff LegalForce, Inc.'s ("LegalForce") "Administrative Motion," filed May 1, 2018, "to Seek Court's Clarification in the Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint." Defendants have not filed a response thereto. Having read and considered LegalForce's Administrative Motion, the Court rules as follows.

The Administrative Motion is procedurally improper, as it is not "accompanied . . . by a declaration that explains why a stipulation could not be obtained." See Civil L.R. 7-11(a). Moreover, the motion does not seek clarification of the Court's prior order, but, rather, an advisory opinion as to how the Court might rule if LegalForce, in the future, were to file an amended pleading, a motion for leave to amend, or a new action.

Accordingly, LegalForce's Administrative Motion is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 9, 2018


MAKIME M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge