

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDIN S. CASTELLANOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendant.

No. C 15-00272 JSW

**ORDER REQUIRING REDLINE
VERSION OF FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT AND NOTICE TO
PARTIES**

Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. On June 26, 2015, this Court issued an Order requiring Plaintiff to file an amended complaint, which comported with concessions made in response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. In that same Order, the Court denied Defendants motion to dismiss without prejudice, and stated that Defendants could renew their arguments by way of a properly noticed motion for judgment on the pleadings.

Plaintiff has filed his First Amended Complaint, and Defendants have filed a motion entitled motion for judgment on the pleadings and/or to dismiss/and or to strike. It is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall file a redline version of his First Amended Complaint so that the Court may compare it to his original allegations. Plaintiff shall file the redline version by no later than August 7, 2015.


The Court also notes that the footnotes in Plaintiff's opposition brief violate Northern District Civil Local Rule 3-4(c)(2). The Court **HEREBY ADVISES** all parties that if any party fails to comply with that rule in the future, the Court shall strike the offending brief without

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

further notice to that party.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 30, 2015



JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE