

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

CLEAR-VIEW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN H. RASNICK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-02744-BLF](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SHORTEN TIME**

[Re: ECF 169]

On April 2, 2015, Proposed Intervenor Stroz Friedberg moved to intervene in this action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1). Presently before the Court is Stroz Friedberg's motion to shorten time in which to hear its motion to intervene. Defendants oppose.

Stroz Friedberg was employed to forensically analyze Defendants' electronic databases in relation to this action, and moves to intervene based on a dispute over Defendants' non-payment for services rendered. *See* ECF 155 at 2. Trial in this case is scheduled to begin on June 8, 2015, and Plaintiff and Defendants are scheduled to appear for pre-trial conference on May 28, 2015. Stroz Friedberg asks the Court to shorten time because, if the motion to intervene is granted, it wishes to "conduct limited discovery before the current trial date." Mot. to Shorten Time, ECF 169 at 2.


Defendants oppose Stroz Friedberg's motion to shorten time, and have indicated that they will file an opposition to the motion to intervene on April 16, 2015. *See* Opp., ECF 171 at 2. Defendants ask the Court to adjudicate Stroz Friedberg's motion to intervene on the briefs alone, so as not to pull the parties away from trial preparation. *See id.*

The Court ultimately agrees with Defendants. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the

1 Court finds that the motion to intervene is appropriately determined without oral argument.¹ Stroz
2 Friedberg's reply is due to be filed on April 23, 2015. The Court will promptly render a decision
3 on Stroz Friedberg's motion upon receipt of its reply brief. This will permit the Court to issue its
4 decision prior to even the expedited April 30, 2015 hearing date requested by Stroz Friedberg.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: April 14, 2015

7 
8 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ¹ Rule 7-1(b) also permits the Court to hold a telephone conference call instead of oral argument.
27 *See id.* ("In the Judge's discretion, . . . a motion may be determined without oral argument or by
28 telephone conference call."). If the Court finds that it needs additional information or argument in
order to adjudicate the motion to intervene, it will contact the parties to schedule such a
conference call. The parties shall make themselves available on April 27, 2015 if such a call is
needed.