

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

DANIELLE STEINER, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
VI-JON INC,  
Defendant.

Case No. 23-cv-00473-AMO

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 74

Before the Court is Defendant Vi-Jon, Inc.’s (“Vi-Jon”) motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s Order granting in part and denying in part Vi-Jon’s motion to dismiss. On October 24, 2024, the Court held a conference with the parties to discuss whether Vi-Jon’s proposed motion seeking reconsideration should be presented through a different procedural mechanism. The Court does not here summarize the entirety of the conversation, but the parties left the conference with directions to meet and confer regarding a briefing schedule on a narrowly focused motion for summary judgment from Vi-Jon.

Upon further reflection, the Court finds that the proper procedural mechanism for the relief sought by Vi-Jon is a motion for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c), not a motion under Rule 56. Vi-Jon substantively challenges the plausibility of Plaintiffs’ claims (*see* ECF 74), and for that reason, a motion for judgment on the pleadings is more appropriate. *See Cafasso, U.S. ex rel. v. General Dynamics C4 Systems, Inc.*, 637 F.3d 413, 418 (9th Cir. 2012) (applying the particularity requirements of Rule 9(b) in the context of a Rule 12(c) motion). Though it does not reach this conclusion at this time, the Court is inclined to find the test results incorporated in the operative complaint by reference. *See Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 988, 1002 (9th Cir. 2018) (discussing incorporation by reference doctrine).

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


Therefore, the Court **ORDERS** the parties to meet and confer and to submit a proposed briefing schedule on Vi-Jon’s Rule 12(c) motion by no later than noon PST on October 31, 2024.

The Court hereby **DENIES** Vi-Jon’s motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

The Court hereby **STAYS** discovery pending resolution of Vi-Jon’s Rule 12(c) motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 24, 2024

  
ARACELI MARTÍNEZ-OLGUÍN  
United States District Judge