F.3d 1271, 1273 n.3 (9th Cir. 1993). Therefore, the court cannot consider new evidence provided in a reply when the other party does not have an opportunity to respond to the evidence. *Provenz v.* Miller, 102 F.3d 1478, 1483 (9th Cir. 1996).

24

25

26

¹ Refers to the court's docket number.

Here, defendants argue that their reply brief only responds to certain arguments raised in TLC's opposition, and as such, these arguments should not be stricken from the reply. The court agrees. However, the court finds that based on the breadth of arguments raised in the reply, TLC should be granted an opportunity to provide a brief response. See Cedars-Sinai Medical Center v. Shalala, 177 F.3d 1126, 1129 (9th Cir. 1999) (a court has the inherent authority to grant leave to a party to file a sur-reply when the information would be germane to the court's evaluation of a pending matter). Therefore, the court shall deny TLC's motion to strike, but allow TLC to file a sur-reply.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to strike (Doc. #32) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff shall file a brief sur-reply to defendants' motion for a preliminary injunction of no more than ten (10) pages, within fifteen (15) days of entry of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 9th day of May, 2013.

Flsihe

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE