

1 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
Acting United States Attorney
2 DAVID M. HARRIS
Assistant United States Attorney
3 Chief, Civil Division
DANIEL A. BECK (Cal. Bar No. 204496)
4 Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Complex and Defensive Litigation Section
5 Federal Building, Suite 7516
300 North Los Angeles Street
6 Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 894-2574
7 E-mail: Daniel.Beck@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Federal Respondents

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11

12 ROBERT GEORGE HOGARTH,
13 Petitioner,
14 v.
15 ERNESTO M. SANTACRUZ JR., et
16 al.,
17 Respondents.
18

No. 2:25-cv-09472-SPG-MAR

**RESPONDENTS' OBJECTION TO
PETITIONER'S UNAUTHORIZED
REPLY BRIEF**

Honorable Sherilyn Peace Garnett
United States District Judge

**FEDERAL RESPONDENTS' OBJECTION TO PETITIONER'S
UNAUTHORIZED REPLY BRIEF**

On October 9, 2025, this Court issued an order [[Dkt. no. 13](#)] (the "OSC Order") granting a temporary restraining order and requiring the Federal Respondents to show cause as to why a preliminary injunction should not issue. The OSC Order also set a specific briefing schedule, with Petitioner filing an opening brief on October 10, 2025, and Respondents filing an opposing brief by 5:00 p.m. on October 14, 2025, and the hearing set at 9:00 a.m. on October 15, 2025.

Petitioner, however, then filed a "motion" for a preliminary injunction on October 10, 2025 [[Dkt. 14](#)] (the PI Motion). The PI Motion was not actually just an opening brief, but rather a lengthy set of moving papers. Nor did the PI Motion's inordinately long supporting memorandum comply with Local Rule 11-6.2.

Respondents filed a concise opposition on October 14, 2025 [[Dkt. 15](#)].

Anticipating, however, that Petitioner would be unable to resist filing an unauthorized reply brief, given his efforts to over-litigate every possible aspect of this case to date, Respondents also drafted this objection in advance to such a reply.¹

As expected, Petitioner then filed his unauthorized reply brief later in the evening of October 14, 2025 [[Dkt. 16](#)].

Respondents object. The Petitioner's unauthorized reply brief should be stricken. Briefing schedules and the Local Rules are important. They cannot be continuously disregarded whenever that may provide an inappropriate advantage over an opponent. Civil procedure is important.

¹ In other words this procedural objection was drafted in advance, rather than responding to whatever the content of the unauthorized reply brief might turn out to be.

1 Dated: October 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
Acting United States Attorney
3 DAVID M. HARRIS
Assistant United States Attorney
4 Chief, Civil Division
DANIEL A. BECK
5 Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Complex and Defensive Litigation Section
6

7 /s/ Daniel A. Beck

8 DANIEL A. BECK
Assistant United States Attorney

9 Attorneys for Federal Respondents

10
11
12 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH L.R. 11-6.2**

13 The undersigned, counsel of record for the Federal Respondents, certifies that the
14 memorandum of points and authorities contains 244 words, which complies with the
15 word limit of L.R. 11-6.1.
16

17 Dated: October 14, 2025

/s/ Daniel A. Beck

18 DANIEL A. BECK
Assistant United States Attorney

19 Attorneys for Federal Respondents
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28