

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,)	Case No.: 11-CV-01043-LHK
)	Related Case No: 11-CV-02135-LHK
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
)	CHANGE TIME FOR OPPOSITION TO
INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY)	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
DISTRIBUTORS, INC.,)	
)	(re: dkt. #157)
Defendant.)	

On July 19, 2012, Innovative Technology Distributors, LLC (“ITD”) moved for an order extending the time for ITC’s opposition to Oracle’s motion for summary judgment by four days, from July 26, 2012, to July 30, 2012. *See* ECF No. 157. Oracle opposes the request. *See* ECF No. 158.


Under Civil Local Rule 7-3, ITD’s opposition to the motion for summary judgment is due July 26, 2012. ITD’s sole asserted basis for the requested extension is that it “needs additional time to respond to Oracle’s Motion for Summary Judgment, which includes a 25-page memorandum of points and authorities and a declaration with 66 exhibits [totaling] 200-pages of evidentiary materials.” *Id.* This is not good cause for an enlargement of time. Oracle’s motion for summary judgment complies with the page limitations set forth in Civil Local Rule 7-4, and its accompanying evidentiary submissions are not unreasonably voluminous. ITD has not shown how it will be unfairly prejudiced by having to comply with the Civil Local Rules. Moreover, any

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

extension given to ITD would in fairness have to be extended to Oracle's reply deadline, which would encroach on the Court's time to review the motion. Accordingly, no good cause having been shown, ITD's motion for enlargement of time to file its opposition is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 26, 2012



LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge