

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

E-filed on: 8/29/13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

TRACY WATSON, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, *et al.*,
Defendants.

No. C-06-04029 RMW

**ORDER RE FURTHER BRIEFING ON
ATTORNEYS' FEES**

[Re: Dkt. No. 535]

In reviewing the briefing submitted by the parties with respect to the motion for attorneys' fees sought by plaintiffs from defendant City of San Jose police officers William Hoyt and Craig Blank, the court notes that defendants may not have had the opportunity to respond to the itemization of services filed by plaintiffs and required by Civil Local Rule 54-5. The itemization was filed on November 1, 2012 (Dkt. No. 544) which was the same date that the officers' opposition was filed (Dkt. No. 543). If the defendants wish to respond to plaintiffs' itemization of services, they must file their response on or before September 12, 2013. If defendants do respond, any reply by plaintiffs must be filed by September 19, 2013.

ORDER RE ATTORNEYS' FEES
No. C-06-04029 RMW
AG

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 DATED: August 29, 2013



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge

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

ORDER RE ATTORNEYS' FEES
No. C-06-04029 RMW
AG