UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FILED	
NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES	
	MAR 7 2006
	Thi space for CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COUNTRY Stamp
TO: 7	BOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
FROM: L Odierno,	CT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE BYThompson 2/6/96
CASE TITLE: USA v. Fallbrook Public Utility District, et al	
DOCUMENT ENTITLE	ED: Employment Agreement
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:	
✓ Local Rule	Discrepancy
5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
7.1	Missing table of contents
15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
	Supplemental documents require court order
	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
$\overline{\square}$	OTHER: No Proof of Service
_	
	Date forwarded: 3/6/06
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
T IS HEREBY ORDER	
The document is to	be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.	
Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers	
Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant	
to Local Rule 83.1	CHAMBERS OF: 5 Thangian
Dated: 3/7	/o.c. By: D. R. J C.