C	ase 2:19-cv-03212-SVW-GJS Document 58	Filed 06/04/2	0 Page 1 of 3 Page ID #:1372
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney (SBN 111529x) KATHLEEN A. KENEALY, Chief Assistant City Attorney (SBN 212289) SCOTT MARCUS, Chief, Civil Litigation Branch (SBN 184980) GABRIEL S. DERMER, Supervising City Attorney (SBN 229424) BENJAMIN CHAPMAN, Deputy City Attorney (SBN 234436) benjamin.chapman@lacity.org 200 North Main Street, 6th Floor, City Hall East Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone Number: 213.978.7556 Facsimile Number: 213.978.8214 Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES		
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION		
12			
13	NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF) Case No.:	19-cv-03212-SVW-GJS
14	AMERICA; JOHN DOE,)	
15		/	ANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES'S
	Plaintiffs,		ION TO AND REQUEST TO STRIKE 3-22 IN PLAINTIFFS' REPLY
16	VS.	/	ECAUSE THEY ARE IN EXCESS OF
17	CITY OF LOS ANGELES; ERIC		URT'S MAXIMUM PAGE LIMIT
18	GARCETTI, in his official capacity as)	
19	Mayor of the City of Los Angeles;) Ctrm:	10A-First Street Courthouse
	HOLLY L. WOLCOTT, in her official) Judge:	Hon. Stephen V. Wilson
20	capacity as City Clerk of the City of Los)	
21	Angeles, and DOES 1-10,) Action Fi	led: 04/24/2019
22	Defendants.)	
23)	
24)	
25		/	
26			
27			
28			
	CITY'S OBJECTION TO AND REQUEST TO STRIKE PAGES 13-22 IN PLAINTIFFS' REPLY BRIEF BECAUSE THEY ARE IN Excess of the Court's Maximum Page Limit		

On June 1, 2020, Plaintiffs filed a <u>22 page</u> reply brief (not including tables and proof of service) in support of their motion for attorneys' fees. (Dkt. No. 57.) This is in violation of the Court's Standing Order regarding page limits: "Replies ... shall not exceed <u>12 pages</u>. These are <u>maximum</u> page limits." (Dkt. No. 11 § 3-A (emphasis in original).) The irony of this: in response to an opposition arguing that Plaintiffs overworked this straightforward case, Plaintiffs file a reply brief that is nearly double the maximum page limit.

Accordingly, the City objects to pages 13-22 of the reply brief, and respectfully requests that the Court refuse to consider these excessive pages and/or strike them from the docket. See, e.g., Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) ("It is well established that district courts have inherent power to control their docket.... This includes the power to strike items from the docket as a sanction for litigation conduct." (quotation marks and citation omitted)); ITN Flix, LLC v. Hinojosa, No. 2:14-CV-08797-ODW (AGRx), 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131879, at *9 n.5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2019) ("Defendants' ... reply papers in connection with their motion to dismiss fail to comply with this Court's local rules.... [T]he reply exceeds the twelve-page limit.... Accordingly, the Court does not consider pages thirteen through twenty four of ... Defendants' Reply."); Yocum v. CBS Corp., No. CV 17-01061 SJO (AJWx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66097, at *6 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017) (striking excessive pages in reply brief that exceeded the Court's five-page limit and holding that it would "only consider the first five pages of the Reply"); Eksouzian v. Albanese, No. CV 13-728 PSG (AJWx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 189545, at *11-12 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2015) (refusing to consider arguments raised in reply brief that was "twenty-two pages, nearly double the twelve-page limit in the Court's Standing Order" because "[t]he Court, at its discretion, may refuse to consider pages or briefing that violates its standing orders"); Bucur v. Fedex Ground Package Sys., No. EDCV 15-01117-JGB (KKx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 190203, at *2 n.1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2015) ("Because Defendants' Reply violates the 12-page limit set in this Court's Standing Order ..., the Court has considered Defendants' Reply through page 12 only.");

1

Estes v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, No. EDCV 10-00807 VAP (DTBx), 2010 U.S. Dist.
LEXIS 159282, at *5 n.3 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2010) (refusing to consider pages 13 through 19 of reply brief because the brief exceeded the Court's twelve page limit).

Dated: June 4, 2020

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY OF LOS ANGELES

By:

/s/ Benjamin Chapman

Benjamin Chapman

Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES