

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 OAKLAND DIVISION
4

5 RAVENSWOOD CITY SCHOOL
6 DISTRICT,

7 Plaintiff,

8 vs.

9 J.S., a minor, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No: C 10-03950 SBA

**ORDER DENYING JOINT
MOTION TO FILE OVERSIZED
BRIEFS**

Docket 77

11
12 The parties have filed a joint administrative motion for leave to file opening and
13 opposition briefs that are forty-five pages in length and a twenty-page reply. Dkt. 77. This
14 case is not sufficiently complex to warrant briefs of that length. Moreover, the parties
15 should be aware that arguments presented in a direct and concise manner are generally
16 more effective than those that are not. See Fleming v. County of Kane, State of Ill., 855
17 F.2d 496, 497 (7th Cir. 1988) (“Overly long briefs, however, may actually hurt a party’s
18 case, making it far more likely that meritorious arguments will be lost amid the mass of
19 detail.”) (quoting in part United States v. Keplinger, 776 F.2d 678, 683 (7th Cir. 1985));
20 Weilert v. Health Midwest Development Group, 95 F. Supp. 2d 1190, 1192 (D. Kan. 2000)
21 (“Judicial economy and concise argument are purposes of the page limit.”). Accordingly,

22 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the parties’ joint motion for leave to file
23 oversized briefs is DENIED. Both parties are directed to avoid the excessive use of
24 footnotes as a means of circumscribing the page limits specified in Civil Local Rules 7-
25 2(a), 7-3(a) and 7-3(c). This Order terminates Docket 77.

26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: February 28, 2010

28 
SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge