

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ERNEST EVANS, et al.,
Plaintiff,

No. C 13-02477 WHA

v.

**ORDER SETTING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE**


HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, et
al.,
Defendants.

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on June 26 along with a stipulation and proposed order requesting that the Court extend the parties' briefing deadlines on the motion. The basis of the request was to accommodate the parties' vacation schedules and periods of unavailability. The stipulation was not entered, and the proposed order remains pending. Nevertheless, the parties have afforded themselves additional time without leave of the Court, and in violation of the Local Rules. Plaintiffs filed their opposition a week and a half late on July 22. Defendants, or so it would appear based on the stipulation, intend to file their reply a week and a half late.

The request to modify the briefing schedule is **DENIED**. It is too late to correct plaintiffs' misapprehension of the scheduling rules, though other remedies remain available. In the meantime, defendants shall file their reply brief no later than **JULY 29 AT 8:00 A.M.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 24, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE