

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 COLIN SCHOLL, et al.,  
8 Plaintiffs,  
9  
10 v.  
11 STEVEN MNUCHIN, et al.,  
12 Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-05309-PJH

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF FOR AMICI  
CURIAE**

Re: Dkt. No. 40

Before the court is a motion for leave to file brief for amici curiae. Dkt. 40. No party opposes the motion.

“The district court has broad discretion to appoint amici curiae.” 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 or entity seeking to appear as amicus must merely make a showing that his/its participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court.” In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig., No. 02-md-01486-PJH, 2007 WL 2022026, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2007). “District courts frequently welcome amicus briefs from non-parties concerning legal issues that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or if the amicus has ‘unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide.’” NGV Gaming, Ltd. v. Upstream Point Molate, LLC, 355 F. Supp. 2d 1061, 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (quoting Cobell v. Norton, 246 F. Supp. 2d 59, 62 (D.D.C. 2003)).

Having reviewed the motion, and for good cause shown, the court hereby

1 GRANTS the motion for leave to file a brief for amici curiae. The subject briefs are  
2 deemed filed as of the date of the filing of the request for permission, and if opposed, no  
3 replies are permitted.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: September 9, 2020

6 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

7 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

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