

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 SAN JOSE DIVISION

4 BALJINDER SANDHU,
5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 VOLVO CARS OF NORTH AMERICA,
8 LLC, et al.,
9 Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-04987-BLF](#)


**ORDER STRIKING VCUSA'S
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE
OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**

[Re: ECF 41]

10
11
12 On December 22, 2016, Plaintiff filed a notice of supplemental authority in support of his
13 motion to remand the action to Santa Clara Superior Court. ECF 40. Defendant Volvo Car USA,
14 LLC (“VCUSA”) subsequently filed a substantive response to Plaintiff’s notice. ECF 40. Under
15 Civil Local Rule 7-3(d), once a reply is filed, but before the noticed hearing date, “no additional
16 memoranda, papers or letters may be filed without prior Court approval,” with certain enumerated
17 exceptions. Civ. L.R. 7-3(d). One of the exceptions is that “counsel may bring to the Court’s
18 attention a relevant judicial opinion published after the date the opposition or reply was filed . . .
19 without argument.” Civ. L.R. 7-3(d)(2). Here, while Plaintiff’s notice complies with the Civil
20 Local Rules, Defendant’s one-page substantive response does not because the Court did not grant
21 VCUSA leave to file the paper. Because VCUSA’s response violates Civil Local Rule 7-3(d), the
22 Court STRIKES it.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24
25 Dated: December 27, 2016

26 
27 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
28 United States District Judge