UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER CORCORAN, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

CVS HEALTH, ET AL.,

Defendants.

CASE No. 15-cv-03504-YGR

ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO FILE SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION

On May 9, 2017, and pursuant to the Court's standing order, defendant filed a letter requesting a summary judgment conference and permission to file a summary judgment motion. (Dkt. 266.) On May 12, 2017, plaintiff filed a response. (Dkt. 268.) The Court has reviewed and considered the letters. Good cause appearing, the defendant's request to file its motion is granted without the need of a conference on the grounds set forth in its letter.

Parties should not construe this order as a reflection on the merits of the proposed motion.

Rather, the Court is quite familiar with the issues and the parties' respective positions. Further, the proposed motion is narrow.

Nonetheless, parties are reminded of the following: (i) defendant is limited to one motion for summary judgment; (ii) findings of triable issues of material fact necessitating a denial of any motion are usually concluded with short orders as the Court does not provide advisory opinions on issues of fact; (iii) parties must file separate statements of facts which should be *devoid of argument* and hyperbole; (iv) footnotes must be in 12-point font; (v) requests for motions to seal at the summary judgment stage are considered under a standard, the analogy of which would be to close the courtroom doors to the public; and (vi) under the Local Rules, evidentiary objections must be made within the context of the memoranda.

United States District Court Northern District of California

Parties are further advised that the Court has not decided whether to delay ruling on any motion for summary judgment prior to the anticipated motion for class certification.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 15, 2017

YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE