

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

CHILDREN’S HEALTH DEFENSE,
Plaintiff,
v.
FACEBOOK INC., *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. [20-cv-05787-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO FILE
AMICUS BRIEF**

Re: Dkt. No. 89

United States District Court
Northern District of California

The Rutherford Institute has filed a motion requesting leave to file an amicus brief. “The district court has broad discretion to permit amicus briefs.” *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982). “There are no strict prerequisites that must be established prior to qualifying for amicus status; an individual seeking to appear as amicus must merely make a showing that his participation is useful or otherwise desirable to the court.” *California by & through Becerra v. United States Dep’t of the Interior*, 381 F. Supp. 3d 1153, 1164 (N.D. Cal. 2019).

The Court exercises its discretion and DENIES the motion to file an amicus brief. The Court has reviewed the proposed amicus brief and finds that it addresses the same issues that have already been amply covered in the parties’ voluminous briefing, and thus that the amicus brief is not useful to the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 7, 2021



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge