	Case3:09-cv-02292-JW Document209 Filed09/28/09 Page1 of 2
1	
2	
3	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5	
6	KRISTIN M PERRY, SANDRA B STIER, NO C 09-2292 VRW
7	PAUL T KATAMI and JEFFREY J ZARRILLO, ORDER
8	Plaintiffs,
9	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
10	Plaintiff-Intervenor,
11	v
12	ARNORLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official capacity as governor of
13	California; EDMUND G BROWN JR, in his official capacity as attorney
14	general of California; MARK B HORTON, in his official capacity
15	as director of the California Department of Public Health and
16	state registrar of vital statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in her
17	official capacity as deputy director of health information &
18	strategic planning for the California Department of Public
19	Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official capacity as clerk-
20	recorder of the County of Alameda; and DEAN C LOGAN, in his
21	official capacity as registrar- recorder/county clerk for the
22	County of Los Angeles,
23	Defendants,
24	DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J KNIGHT, MARTIN F GUTIERREZ,
25	HAKSHING WILLIAM TAM and MARK A JANSSON, as official proponents
26	of Proposition 8,
27	Defendant-Intervenors.
28	

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

.

On September 25, 2009, defendant-intervenors ("proponents") moved for administrative relief to exceed the page limitations for their reply in support of their summary judgment Doc #208. Proponents argue that additional pages are motion. necessary to address the issues raised in plaintiffs' response. Id at 3. Because the extension appears reasonable, proponents' motion is GRANTED. Proponents' reply shall not exceed twenty-five pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

An la

VAUGHN R WALKER United States District Chief Judge