




1 not change the time” for the issues Plaintiffs seek to have addressed by November 1, 2012. *See*  
2 Civ. L.R. 6-3. The issues Plaintiffs raise are complicated and require thoughtful briefing by both  
3 parties and careful consideration by the Court, which is compromised by the greatly  
4 abbreviated schedule Plaintiffs seek. Moreover, these issues have been raised and disputed for  
5 months, and Plaintiffs have not identified a persuasive reason as to why they were unable to file  
6 their motion earlier. On the other hand, Plaintiffs’ motion for enforcement was filed on  
7 September 15, 2012, so Defendants have had weeks to review and understand Plaintiffs’  
8 arguments; indeed, since the filing of the motion, the parties have engaged in substantial meet  
9 and confer discussions regarding Plaintiffs’ concerns.

10 Accordingly, the Court sets the following schedule for the three issues raised in Plaintiffs’  
11 October 11, 2012 letter: Defendants shall file a response on or before October 29, 2012.  
12 Plaintiffs shall file a reply, if any, by November 2, 2012. A hearing is scheduled for November 8,  
13 2012 at 9:00 am in Courtroom F on the 15<sup>th</sup> Floor of 450 Golden Gate Avenue.

14 Plaintiffs have indicated an intent to file another motion for enforcement of the  
15 settlement on additional issues and to seek a hearing on or before December 1, 2012. If  
16 Plaintiffs contemplate such a motion, then it shall be filed at least 35 days before the requested  
17 hearing date.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: October 17, 2012

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28