Case 2:15-cv-02573-PSG-JPR Document 28 Filed 07/08/15 Page 1 of 4 Page ID #:246

Plaintiff Human Rights Watch ("HRW") opposes the government's request (ECF No. 27) to continue the hearing on HRW's Motion for Expedited Discovery, currently set for July 13. Efficiency and preservation of the Court's and the parties' resources are best served by hearing the Motion as scheduled.

- 1. The government's Motion to Dismiss constitutes a factual attack on HRW's complaint—purportedly introducing a disputed factual issue relevant to HRW's standing. *See* Reply in Support of Motion for Expedited Discovery ("Reply") at 5-7, 9-10 (ECF No. 26); *see also* Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 24-1) & Declaration of Robert W. Patterson (ECF No. 24-2).
- 2. Discovery, like that sought through this Motion, is the only method to resolve that factual dispute. Consideration of this Motion should thus occur *before* further briefing or hearing on the government's Motion to Dismiss. *See* Reply at 5-7, 9-10.
- 3. Delaying consideration of this Motion would require the Court to evaluate—and HRW to argue against—the government's Motion to Dismiss on an incomplete and one-sided factual record.

```
24
25
26
///
```

///

1	Accordingly, the Motion for Expedited Discovery can and should be heard
2	now. ¹
3	Dated: July 8, 2015 Respectfully submitted,
4	Respectivity submitted,
5	s/ Mark Rumold
6	<u>s/ Mark Rumold</u> MARK RUMOLD
7	DAVID GREENE
8	NATHAN D. CARDOZO LEE TIEN
	KURT OPSAHL
9	HANNI FAKHOURY
10	JAMIE L. WILLIAMS
11	ANDREW CROCKER
12	ELECTRONIC FRONTIER
13	FOUNDATION
14	Counsel for Plaintiff Human Rights Watch
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	HRW respectfully submits that, if anything, it is the August 17 hearing that
24	should be continued. Because the government has created a factual dispute
25	concerning jurisdiction, HRW should be afforded an opportunity to take full and adequate discovery concerning the matter. That discovery, in turn, may require
26	more time than the current briefing and hearing schedule affords. The hearing on
27	the government's Motion to Dismiss—not this hearing—should therefore be stayed
28	pending resolution of these discovery matters.
20	<u></u>

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the
3 4	Court for the United States District Court for the Central District of California by
5	using the Court's CM/ECF system on July 8, 2015.
6	I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and
7 8	that service will be accomplished by the Court's CM/ECF system.
9	
10	Dated: July 8, 2015 <u>s/ Mark Rumold</u>
11	MARK RUMOLD
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	3
	Opposition to Defendants' Request to Continue Heading

OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO CONTINUE HEARING CASE NO: 2:15-cv-2573-PSG-JPR

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO CONTINUE HEARING

28

Case 2:15-cv-02573-PSG-JPR Document 28-1 Filed 07/08/15 Page 2 of 3 Page ID #:251

CONTINUE HEARING CASE No: 2:15-cv-2573-PSG-JPR

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the
3	Court for the United States District Court for the Central District of California by
4	
5	using the Court's CM/ECF system on July 8, 2015.
6	I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and
7	that service will be accomplished by the Court's CM/ECF system.
8	
9	
10	Dated: July 8, 2015 <u>s/ Mark Rumold</u> MARK RUMOLD
11	WARK RUMOLD
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO

CASE No: 2:15-cv-2573-PSG-JPR