Defendant's Motion to Shorten Time for Consideration of Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss or for Clarification - 1.

Z\!\PClient\ImpulseMarketingGroup v. Gordon\Pleadings\Plaintiff Motion for S u m a r y Judgment\DefendantsMotionReschedulePlaintiffMSJ051018\Memo.ReschedulePl

aintiffMSJ.051018.wpd

LIEBLER, IVEY, CONNOR, BERRY & ST. HILAIRE Attorneys at Law P.O. Box 6125 Kennewick, Washington 99336-0125 (509) 735-3581 of Disputed Facts. Defendant filed its LR56.1 Statement of Disputed Facts on Friday, October 14, 2005. Consideration of Plaintiff's LR56.1 Statement of Material Fact led Defendant to the realization that Defendant lacks a basis to respond to eleven of the twenty-six "Facts" asserted by Plaintiff to be Material Facts.

The normal course of litigation provides for Discovery followed by the filing of dispositive motions. Plaintiff's early motion, converted to a Motion for Summary Judgment, predates any discovery. Several "Material Facts" asserted by Plaintiff are allegations from Plaintiff's Complaint. The Defendant is without the ability to do more than reassert the denial found in Defendant's Answer.

Defendant requests the Rescheduling or Striking of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment until the completion of Discovery. Defendant's Motion is in recognition and apprehension of possible waiver by Defendant wherein Facts deemed to be Material Facts by the Plaintiff, being unrefuted regardless of the reason, may be taken by the Court to be the facts on which the Court will rule. Defendant notes holdings relative to similar issues as follows: *USA Petroleum Co. v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* 13 F.3d 1276, 1284 (9th Cir. Cal. 1994) at Footnote 13 where a party asserted a legal theory but failed to pursue it adequately it was held that the opportunity had been granted; *Han v. Mobil Oil Corp.* 73 F.3d 872, 876 (9th Cir. Cal. 1995) where affirmative defenses realized during discovery may be raised for the first time on a motion for summary judgment; *Allen v. Scribner* 812 F.2d 426, 435 (9th Cir. Cal. 1987) at footnote 18 holds that a party failing to move to strike an affidavit that is defective under Rule 56(e) waives any objection to the afficavit.

Discovery will allow the Defendant to properly assemble and test the evidence and then determine the existence of evidence which will indeed dispute

2.1

Defendant's Motion to Shorten Time for Consideration of Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss or for Clarification - 2. Z:\IPClient\ImpulseMarketingGroup v. Gordon\Pleadings\Plaintiff Motion for

LIEBLER, IVEY, CONNOR, BERRY & ST. HILAIRE Attorneys at Law P.O. Box 6125 Kennewick, Washington 99336-0125 (509) 735-3581