

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

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, EX REL., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [02-cv-04621-KAW](#)

ORDER TO SHOW TO CAUSE

Re: Dkt. No. 75

On September 18, 2015, Defendants filed a motion to dissolve the injunction issued on April 28, 2003, which enjoined Defendants, along with Intervenor-Defendant the Town of Mammoth Lakes, “from commencing any construction or other work on the [Mammoth Yosemite] airport expansion project pending conformance with all NEPA requirements, including completion and adoption of an Environmental Impact Statement.” (Defs.’ Mot., Dkt. No. 75 at 1.)

Defendants contend that they conferred with Plaintiffs’ counsel, and were advised that Plaintiffs would likely not take a position on this motion. *Id.* Notwithstanding, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-3, Plaintiffs’ opposition was due on October 2, 2015. Plaintiff did not file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition as required by the Civil Local Rules. *See* Civil L.R. 7-3(b).

Accordingly, by no later than **January 4, 2016**, the Court orders Plaintiffs to file either (1) a statement of non-opposition to the motion to dissolve the injunction, or (2) show cause why the motion should not be granted as unopposed and file an opposition to the motion to dissolve the injunction. Failure to timely file may result in the dissolution of the injunction. *See* Judge Westmore’s General Standing Order ¶ 22 (“The failure of the opposing party to file a

1 memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to any motion shall constitute consent to the
2 granting of the motion”).

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: December 9, 2015


KANDIS A. WESTMORE
United States Magistrate Judge

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28