

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8 SAN JOSE DIVISION
9

10 MELANIE G. SAN PEDRO-SALCEDO,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 THE HAAGEN-DAZS SHOPPE
COMPANY, INC.,

14 Defendant.

Case No. [5:17-cv-03504-EJD](#)

**ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
INCREASE PAGE LIMIT**

Re: Dkt. No. 108

15 Defendant has filed an administrative motion seeking leave to file a reply brief in support
16 of its summary judgment motion that exceeds the 15-page limit set by Civil Local Rule 7-2(c).
17 Defendant contends that good cause exists because (a) Plaintiff's opposition brief (Dkt. No. 100)
18 contains numerous, substantive footnotes that do not comply with the court's standing order for
19 civil cases, and (b) the opposition improperly relies on previously undisclosed documents. The
20 court's standing order provides that "[f]ootnotes shall be in no less than 12-point type and shall be
21 double-spaced." Standing Order § IV.A.4. Plaintiff plainly did not comply with the standing
22 order, and in doing so, Plaintiff also violated the 25-page limit set by Civil Local Rule 7-2(a). The
23 court will not consider any of the footnotes in plaintiff's opposition. *Cho v. UCBH Holdings Inc.*,
24 2011 WL 3809903, at *18 (N.D. Cal. 2011). As to Defendants' second argument, Civil Local
25 Rule 7-2(c) provides, "Any evidentiary . . . objections to the opposition must be contained within
26 the reply brief or memorandum." Accordingly, neither argument justifies allowing Defendant to
27 file a reply brief that exceeds the page limit set by the Civil Local Rules.

28 Case No.: [5:17-cv-03504-EJD](#)

ORDER RE DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO INCREASE PAGE LIMIT

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

Defendant’s administrative motion is denied, and the court will not consider any footnotes that fail to comply with the court’s standing order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 12, 2019



EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge