

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

LARRY WHITE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 11 C 8558
)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

After Social Security claimant Larry White ("White") had prevailed in this action by obtaining a remand of the case to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings, his counsel filed a motion for attorney's fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. This Court acceded to a couple of requests by the parties for extensions in the briefing process, ultimately calling for the government's response to be filed by February 25, 2013 and White's reply memorandum to be filed by March 11.

Although the first two memoranda came in on time, this Court did not receive a chambers copy of a reply by White within the post-March 11 time frame permitted by this District Court's LR 5.2(f). That did not mean that no reply had in fact been filed, for unfortunately too many lawyers are either unaware of or ignore that LR, the latter alternative perhaps being predicated on the mistaken assumption that this Court and its staff are somehow obligated (as we are not) to police their

electronic filings.¹

In any event, this Court's nonreceipt of the anticipated reply led it to have the case docket printed out, and that revealed that White had indeed filed the required reply, while at the same time failing to honor LR 5.2(f). With the docket reflecting that the reply runs some 20 pages, this Court will not impose the burden of reproduction on its staff, instead leaving that burden where the LR places it. Accordingly White is ordered to deliver a chambers copy of the reply to this Court's chambers forthwith, accompanied by a check for \$100 payable to the "Clerk of the District Court" in accordance with the forewarning at the very beginning of this Court's website.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: March 19, 2013

¹ Even on that assumption, its consequence would be to shift to this Court's staff the burden and expense of having to print out often lengthy documents. LR 5.2(f) was of course aimed at avoiding that consequence.