



1 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).<sup>4</sup> The four motions were set for hearing on October 30, 2012, and the court  
2 continued hearing on the motions until November 6, 2012.<sup>5</sup> Defendants request the court delay the  
3 briefing and hearing of Plaintiffs' motions until the court issues a decision on Defendants' JMOL.

4 Civil L.R. 6-3(b) requires movants to "set[] forth with particularity, the reasons for the  
5 requested enlargement" and to identify "the substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if" the  
6 motion was not granted. Defendants argue that because their JMOL may result in an overturn or  
7 new interpretation of the jury verdict, the court's decision may moot or materially affect the  
8 outcome of Plaintiffs' motions. That may be so. But if anything Defendants' argument would  
9 appear to support consolidating hearing all of the motions so that the court may consider the  
10 appropriate outcome for the various post-trial motions at one time. At the very least, Defendants  
11 have not identified any substantial harm or prejudice that would result if Plaintiffs' motions were  
12 not postponed.

13 Accordingly, Defendants' motion to enlarge time for briefing and argument of Plaintiffs'  
14 motions is DENIED.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: September  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28