

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

COLIN SCHOLL, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
STEVEN MNUCHIN, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-05309-PJH

**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

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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
8 United States District Judge
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