

R. Scott Jerger (*pro hac vice*) (Oregon State Bar #02337)
Field Jerger LLP
621 SW Morrison, Suite 1225
Portland, OR 97205
Tel: (503) 228-9115
Fax: (503) 225-0276
Email: scott@fieldjerger.com

John C. Gorman (CA State Bar #91515)
Gorman & Miller, P.C.
210 N 4th Street, Suite 200
San Jose, CA 95112
Tel: (408) 297-2222
Fax: (408) 297-2224
Email: jgorman@gormanmiller.com

Attorneys for Defendants
Matthew Katzer and Kamind Associates, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

ROBERT JACOBSEN, an individual,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 MATTHEW KATZER, an individual, and)
 KAMIND ASSOCIATES, INC., an Oregon)
 corporation dba KAM Industries,)
)
 Defendants.)

Case Number C06-1905-JSW
Hearing Date: December 4, 2009
Hearing Time: 9:00am
Place: Ct. 11, Floor 19
Hon. Jeffrey S. White

**DEFENDANTS MATTHEW
KATZER AND KAMIND
ASSOCIATES, INC.'S RESPONSE
IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
UNTIMELY DOCUMENTS**

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

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Is Plaintiff's motion for leave proper under the Civ. Local Rules?

STATEMENT OF FACTS

This Court ordered the parties to complete summary judgment briefing on November 20, 2009 [Dkt# 357]. That happened. In their Reply brief, Defendants pointed out that Plaintiff's could not rely on unsworn expert reports at summary judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56.¹ Plaintiff has filed an unnoticed Motion for Leave in response.

ARGUMENT

Briefly, in reply to Plaintiff's response to the objection, the change in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(c) discussed by Plaintiff is irrelevant to the issue at hand. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e) requires that affidavits in support of summary judgment be sworn as discussed in Defendants' Reply brief.

More importantly, Plaintiff's substantive, un-noticed motion for leave to supplement the record with untimely, sworn expert reports does not comply with this Court's Civil Local Rules. Plaintiff's motion, filed on Thanksgiving eve, is not an administrative motion as it deals with the substantive issues of admissibility. Plaintiff's motion does not comply with Civ. Local Rule 7-1 because it was not duly noticed pursuant to Civ. Local Rule 7-2 nor is it in the proper form of a motion as required by Civ. Local Rule 7-2.

Plaintiff's failure to comply with this Court's Local Rules works prejudice on Defendants. Under this Court's local rules, Defendants have until 21 days before the hearing date to respond to this motion. However, Plaintiff has not set a hearing for this motion and the parties are well within 21 days of the summary judgment hearing.

¹ Plaintiff's unsworn expert reports are not relevant to summary judgment since they deal with opinions, not issues of fact.

1 I certify that on November 25, 2009, I served Matthew Katzer's and KAM's RESPONSE
2 IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE on the following parties through
3 their attorneys via the Court's ECF filing system:

4 Victoria K. Hall
5 Attorney for Robert Jacobsen
6 Law Office of Victoria K. Hall
7 3 Bethesda Metro Suite 700
8 Bethesda, MD 20814

David McGowan
Warren Hall
5998 Alcala Park
San Diego, CA 92110

9 _____
10 /s/ Scott Jerger
11 R. Scott Jerger (*pro hac vice*)
12 Field Jerger LLP
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26