1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	OAKLAND DIVISION	
8	ATHENA FEMININE TECHNOLOGIES	Case No: C 10-4868 SBA
9	INC.,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
10	Plaintiff,	<b>RENEWED MOTION FOR LEAVE</b> TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL AND
11	VS.	AMENDED COMPLAINT
12	DEREK WILKES, PELFIT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, MORTON	Dkt. 150
13	CORDELL, SILK ROAD ASSOCIATES,	
14	LLC, SIMON FAN and KING CHAMPIÓN (HONG KONG) LTD.,	
15	Defendants.	
15 16	Defendants.	
	Defendants.	
16		ts Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for
16 17		
16 17 18	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i	omplaint. See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.
16 17 18 19	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The
16 17 18 19 20	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and
16 17 18 19 20 21	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014 Court found that Plaintiff's proposed amendme	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and t this late stage of the litigation would be
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> </ol>	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014 Court found that Plaintiff's proposed amendme conclusory, and that "permitting amendment a	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and t this late stage of the litigation would be n March 4, 2013, Plaintiff filed the instant
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> </ol>	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014 Court found that Plaintiff's proposed amendme conclusory, and that "permitting amendment a unduly prejudicial to Defendants." <u>Id.</u> , *3. On	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and t this late stage of the litigation would be n March 4, 2013, Plaintiff filed the instant ntal and Amended Complaint which is
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014 Court found that Plaintiff's proposed amendme conclusory, and that "permitting amendment a unduly prejudicial to Defendants." <u>Id.</u> , *3. Or renewed Motion for Leave to File a Supplement largely identical to its prior motion. Dkt. 150.	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and t this late stage of the litigation would be n March 4, 2013, Plaintiff filed the instant ntal and Amended Complaint which is
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ol>	On February 6, 2013, the Court issued i Leave to File a Supplemental and Amended Co <u>v. Wilkes</u> , No. 10-4868 SBA, 2013 WL 45014 Court found that Plaintiff's proposed amendme conclusory, and that "permitting amendment a unduly prejudicial to Defendants." <u>Id.</u> , *3. Or renewed Motion for Leave to File a Supplement largely identical to its prior motion. Dkt. 150.	omplaint. <u>See Athena Feminine Techs. Inc.</u> 7 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013), Dkt. 147. The ents were impermissibly vague and t this late stage of the litigation would be n March 4, 2013, Plaintiff filed the instant ntal and Amended Complaint which is

1	fails to make the requisite showing under Local Rule 7-9. The Court may summarily deny		
2	motions that are not filed in compliance with the Court's local rules. See Tri-Valley		
3	<u>CAREs v. U.S. Dept. of Energy</u> , 671 F.3d 1113, 1131 (9th Cir. 2012) ("Denial of a motion		
4	as the result of a failure to comply with local rules is well within a district court's		
5	discretion.").		
6	Setting aside Plaintiff's inexplicable failure to comply with the Local Rules, the		
7	Court is not inclined to permit Plaintiff to file a supplemental pleading in any event.		
8	Although Plaintiff's proposed supplemental pleading addresses some of the vagueness		
9	concerns expressed by the Court in its prior order, the fact remains that allowing the		
10	amendment at this late stage of the proceedings would be unduly prejudicial to Defendants.		
11	Athena Feminine Techs., 2013 WL 450147, *3. Accordingly,		
12	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff's renewed Motion for Leave to File a		
13	Supplemental and Amended Complaint is DENIED. This Order terminates Docket 150.		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
15	Dated: April 29, 2013		
16	SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG United States District Judge		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	- 2 -		