

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 SANDRA L. FERGUSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 BRIAN J. WAID AND THE WAID
14 MARITAL COMMUNITY,

15 Defendants.

Case No. C17-1685 RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR OVER-
LENGTH BRIEF

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Sandra L. Ferguson's Motion for Over-
17 Length Brief. Dkt. #56. The Court has determined that responsive briefing is unnecessary.
18 See LCR 7(f)(3).
19

20 Ms. Ferguson requests 30 pages of briefing for a forthcoming partial summary
21 judgment motion, six pages over the standard 24-page limit. Dkt. #56 at 1; LCR 7(e)(3). Ms.
22 Ferguson states that the recent Minute Order striking her partial summary judgment motion was
23 "helpful in making revisions to the brief. . ." *Id.* However, she states that "Plaintiff has fallen
24 short of meeting the 24-page limit due to the subject matter of the motion," because
25 "Defendant's defamation claim requires a discussion of First Amendment issues and law, and a
26 discussion of an extensive history and evidentiary record related to this defamation claim by
27
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR OVER-LENGTH BRIEF - 1

1 Defendant.” *Id.* at 2. She provides no further detail on this point. She states that “[a]ttempts to
2 shorten the brief at this point will cause the quality and coherence to suffer.” *Id.* Ms. Ferguson
3 explicitly states that the 30-page motion is “attached hereto.” *Id.* at 1. The 30-page motion is
4 not attached.

5
6 The Court begins by noting that this is the fourth time Ms. Ferguson has attempted to
7 file this partial summary judgment motion. The first time, Ms. Ferguson filed a 72-page brief
8 and withdrew it. Dkt. #38. The second time, Ms. Ferguson filed a 30-page brief and withdrew
9 it. Dkt. #41. The third and most recent time, Ms. Ferguson filed a 24-page brief (not including
10 the caption). Dkt. #42. Although this most recent motion was within the page limits, it was
11 stricken by Minute Order for other reasons. *See* Dkt. #54.

12
13 It is unclear to the Court how its March 26, 2018, Minute Order has led Ms. Ferguson
14 to refile with six pages of additional briefing. The Minute Order only asked that Ms. Ferguson
15 properly sign her motion, state her declarations under penalty of perjury, provide the Court with
16 courtesy copies, and refile previously corrected exhibits; it did not address the content of Ms.
17 Ferguson’s motion. *See id.*

18
19 In any event, the Court is in the dark as to the need for additional briefing without
20 seeing the promised attached 30-page motion for partial summary judgment. Ms. Ferguson’s
21 single sentence about the need to discuss First Amendment law and an extensive history does
22 not alone provide a basis for deviating from the standard 24-page limit, which is typically
23 sufficient for cases of constitutional law or with lengthy factual backgrounds. Motions seeking
24 approval to file an over-length motion or brief are disfavored. LCR 7(f). Based solely on the
25 information before it, the Court finds that such approval is not warranted. Given the particular
26 procedural history of this case and Ms. Ferguson’s repeated attempts to file and re-file this
27
28

1 motion for partial summary judgment, the Court will entertain no further motions for over-
2 length briefing from Ms. Ferguson.

3 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
4 finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff Sandra L. Ferguson's Motion for Over-Length Brief (Dkt.
5 #56) is DENIED. The Court will entertain no further motions for over-length briefing from
6 Ms. Ferguson.
7

8 DATED this 28th day of March 2018.

9
10 

11 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28