	Case M:06-cv-01791-VRW	Document 617	Filed 05/08/2009	Page 1 of 3					
	Document hosted at ↓ http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=52b304e4-3784-4df5-89eb-								
1	MICHAEL F. HERTZ								
	Acting Assistant Attorney General DOUGLAS N. LETTER								
	Terrorism Litigation Counsel JOSEPH H. HUNT								
-	Director, Federal Programs Branch ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO								
	Special Litigation Counsel PAUL G. FREEBORNE Trial Attorneys U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch								
5									
6									
	20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 6102 Washington, D.C. 20001								
8	Phone: (202) 514-4782—Fax: (202) 616-8460								
9	Attorneys for the Government Defendants								
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION								
	IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORI	/	. M:06-cv-01791-VRV	W					
	LITIGATION) GOVERNMENT DEFENDANTS') RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION 							
15	This Document Relates To:		EXTEND TIME						
	McMurray et al. v. Verizon Comm., Ind No. 09-cv-0131-VRW		te: June 3, 20 ne: 10:30 a.m						
17	1NO. 09-CV-0131-V K W	,	urtroom: 6, 17th Flo						
18)) Ch	ief Judge Vaughn R.						
19)							
20		The Government Defendants do not oppose plaintiffs' requested extension to May 11,							
21	009 to respond to the Government Defendants' and telecommunication carrier defendants'								
22	notions to dismiss this action, but request that the Court not change the current hearing date of								
23	une 3, 2009.								
24	Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time did not comply with the local rules. Plaintiffs								
25	did not confer with the defendants on a stipulation concerning their requested extension in advance of their motion, as required by Local Rule 6-3(a)(2), nor did they file a declaration in accord with L.R. 6-3(a) &7-11(a). We recognize that circumstances may arise at the last minute								
26									
27									
28	Government Defendants' Response to Plain McMurray et al. v. Verizon Comm. Inc. et al								

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=52b304e4-3784-4df5-89eb-96813976acdb

which require counsel to seek additional time and, thus, do not object to the requested extension. However, no further extensions should be permitted for plaintiffs' oppositions. The Government's motion to dismiss was filed on March 13, 2009. *See* Dkt. 11. That motion was only 8 pages long and addressed a question of law raised by the plaintiffs' complaint—a Fifth Amendment "takings" challenge to Section 802 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. *See id*. The carrier defendants' motion to dismiss was filed on March 16, 2009, and likewise was only 8 pages long. *See* Dkt. 16. Plaintiffs thus have had ample time to address these short motions.¹/

In addition, because the Court is not otherwise available from June 10 through June 26, 2009, the Government respectfully requests that the Court not change the currently scheduled June 3 hearing date. *See* Dkt. 19. Plaintiffs' extension motion and proposed alteration to the briefing schedule (under which the Government and carrier defendants' respective replies would be due on May 26, 2009) would reduce the 14-day period under the local rules for the Court's review of the parties' submission prior to the June 3 hearing. If necessary to maintain the June 3 hearing date, the Government and carrier defendants' would file their replies on May 22, 2009 (just one day beyond the current May 21 reply date.)

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Government requests that, if the Court grants plaintiffs' requested extension, it not change the hearing date of June 3, 2009, and, if necessary to maintain that hearing date, permit the Government and carrier defendants to file their respective replies on May 22, 2009, to avoid further intrusion on the Court's review time that will result from the plaintiffs' belated motion to extend time.

The undersigned counsel for the Government has conferred with counsel for the carrier defendants in this action who have indicated that they agree with the position set forth in this response.

¹ Plaintiffs filed an opposition to the carrier defendants' separate motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. *See* Dkt. 20.

28 Government Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Extend Time McMurray et al. v. Verizon Comm. Inc. et al., 09-cv-0131-VRW (MDL 06-cv1791-VRW).

	Case M:06-cv-01791-VRW	Document 617	Filed 05/08/2009	Page 3 of 3				
	Document hosted at JD http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=52b304e4-3784-4df5-89eb 1 968							
1								
2	May 8, 2009	Respectfully	v Submitted,					
3		MICHAEL Acting Assis	F. HERTZ stant Attorney General					
4			DOUGLAS N. LETTER Terrorism Litigation Counsel					
5		JOSEPH H.	JOSEPH H. HUNT					
6		Director, Fe	deral Programs Branch	1				
7			<u>J. Coppolino</u> J. COPPOLINO					
8			gation Counsel					
9 10		PAUL G. FI Trial Attorn U.S. Departu						
11		Civil Divisio	on, Federal Programs I usetts Avenue, NW, R	Branch m. 6102				
12		Washington	, D.C. 20001) 514-4782—Fax: (202					
13		Email: tony.	coppolino@usdoj.gov	,				
14		Attorneys fo	r the Government Defe	endants				
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28	Government Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Extend Time McMurray et al. v. Verizon Comm. Inc. et al., 09-cv-0131-VRW (MDL 06-cv1791-VRW).3							
					I			