

1  
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
4

5  
6 GOLDEN GATE VILLAGE ELECTION  
COMMITTEE, et al.,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 vs.

9 MARIN HOUSING AUTHORITY, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No.: 12-cv-04226-YGR

**ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANTS' SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT FILINGS**

11  
12 The Court previously granted the parties leave to file cross-motions for summary judgment.  
13 (Dkt. No. 16.) Plaintiffs filed their motion on April 1, 2013, including a separate statement of  
14 undisputed facts as required by this Court's Standing Order in Civil Cases.

15 Defendants filed two separate documents in response: an opposition to Plaintiffs' summary  
16 judgment motion (Dkt. No. 30) and their own motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 20). The  
17 Court's Order did not authorize the filing of an opposition and a separate motion for summary  
18 judgment. The Court intended that one document be filed (*i.e.*, a cross-motion/opposition), as is the  
19 normal practice in this district for cross-motions. By filing an opposition and separate motion,  
20 Defendants have exceeded the 25-page limit otherwise provided by the Local Rules for a single  
21 motion or opposition.

22 Defendants are hereby **ORDERED** to re-file their motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 20)  
23 and opposition to Plaintiffs' motion (Dkt. No. 30) as one document in compliance with this Order, the  
24 Court's Standing Order, and the Local Rules. The Court hereby **STRIKES** Defendants' previous  
25 filings at Dkt. Nos. 20–39.

26 The Court notes that Defendants did not file a responsive separate statement in compliance  
27 with the Court's Standing Order. Defendants are **ORDERED** to review the Court's Standing Order in  
28

1 Civil Cases regarding summary judgment motions and to comply with the requirements therein,  
2 including a responsive separate statement in the required format.

3 Moreover, the Court notes that Defendants filed their various declarations and exhibits as  
4 separate docket entries. When filing future documents, Defendants should link exhibits to their  
5 corresponding declarations, rather than making each exhibit its own docket entry. Defendants may  
6 contact the ECF Help Desk if they have questions.

7 Defendants' revised filings shall be filed by April 23, 2013. Plaintiffs' reply to their  
8 motion/opposition to the cross-motion (which shall also be filed as one document) shall be filed by  
9 April 30, 2013. A reply to the cross-motion (sur-reply) will only be permitted upon request. The  
10 hearing shall be rescheduled to June 4, 2013 at 2:00 p.m.

11 As previously stated in Dkt. No. 16, the Court requests chambers copies in binders with an  
12 index and tabs. In addition, documents should contain the ECF header reflecting docket item number  
13 and filing date. Copies may be double-sided.

14 This Order terminates Dkt. No. 20. The Clerk shall strike Dkt. Nos. 20–39 from the record.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16  
17 Dated: April 16, 2013

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28