

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF RICHMOND,
Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-01535-WHO](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SHORTEN TIME**

Re: Dkt. No. 13

The City of Richmond (“Richmond”) filed its complaint in this action on March 21, 2017. On March 24, 2017 the court issued an Order, relating this case to two prior-filed actions, *County of Santa Clara v. Donald J. Trump*, Case 3:17-cv-00574-WHO, and *City and County of San Francisco v. Donald J. Trump*, Case 3:17-cv-00485-WHO. The court is scheduled to hear oral argument on the plaintiffs’ motions for preliminary injunction in the two related actions on April 14, 2017.

On April 4, 2017, the City of Richmond moved for preliminary injunction. Dkt. No. 12. A hearing on that motion is set for May 10, 2017. Richmond now seeks to shorten the briefing and hearing schedule on its motion so that it can be heard at the same time as the motions in *County of Santa Clara* and *City and County of San Francisco*, on April 14, 2017. Dkt. No. 13. Defendants have objected to the request which would give them just five days, and only three business days, to file their response. Dkt. No. 14.


Richmond’s request to shorten time is DENIED. Any benefit to Richmond in shortening time is greatly outweighed by the prejudice to defendants who, under Civil Local Rule 7-3(a), are

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 entitled to at least fourteen days to prepare a response.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: April 6, 2017

4 

5
6 William H. Orrick
United States District Judge

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California