

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

TATYANA EVGENIEVNA DREVALEVA,

Plaintiff,

No. C 18-03748 WHA

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING
REQUEST TO FILE
SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEFING**

In this *pro se* employment discrimination action, defendants filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to FRCP 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). Plaintiff filed her opposition and defendants responded (Dkt. Nos. 40, 41). Plaintiff now requests leave to file supplemental briefing pursuant to Local Rule 7-3(d).

Local Rule 7-3(d) states, “[o]nce a reply is filed, no additional memoranda, papers, or letters may be filed with the court without prior approval” unless new evidence has been submitted in the reply or relevant judicial opinions were published after the reply or opposition was filed. Neither exception applies here.

Plaintiff alleges that defendants raised new issues in their reply that were not present in their motion to dismiss. Plaintiff, however, fails to identify these new issues and does not explain what information she found to be “misleading” in defendants’ reply (Dkt. No. 42 at 1). Plaintiff has already had the opportunity to present arguments and cite to case law in her

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

opposition and various other requests and motions she has submitted. The Court finds no basis for permitting additional briefing, thus, plaintiff's request for leave to file a supplemental brief is hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 2, 2018.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE