

STANDING ORDER REGARDING MOTIONS TO EXCEED THE PAGE LIMITATIONS OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

Effective Immediately

PRESENT: McKEE, **Chief Judge**, and SLOVITER, SCIRICA, RENDELL, AMBRO, FUENTES, SMITH, FISHER, CHAGARES, JORDAN, HARDIMAN, GREENAWAY, JR, VANASKIE, ALDISERT, WEIS, GARTH, STAPLETON, GREENBERG, COWEN, NYGAARD, ROTH, BARRY, and VAN ANTWERPEN, **Circuit Judges**

AND NOW, it being noted that motions to exceed the page/word limitations for briefs are filed in approximately twenty-five percent of cases on appeal, and that seventy-one percent of those motions seek to exceed the page/word limitations by more than twenty percent;

Notice is hereby given that motions to exceed the page or word limitations for briefs are strongly disfavored and will be granted only upon demonstration of extraordinary circumstances. Such circumstances may include multi-appellant consolidated appeals in which the appellee seeks to file a single responsive brief or complex/consolidated proceedings in which the parties are seeking to file jointly or the subject matter clearly requires expansion of the page or word limitations.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that a three-judge Standing Motions Panel is hereby appointed to rule on all motions to exceed the page/word limitations for briefs since the page/word limitations, prescribed by Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7), should be sufficient to address all issues in an appeal.

It is further **ORDERED** that Counsel are advised to seek advance approval of requests to exceed the page/word limitations whenever possible or run the risk of rewriting and refile a compliant brief. Any request to exceed page/word limitations submitted in the absence of such an advance request shall include an explanation of why counsel could not have foreseen any difficulty in complying with the limitations in time to seek advance approval from the panel.

This order shall not apply to capital habeas cases.



Date: January 9, 2012

By the Court,

/s/ Theodore A. McKee
Chief Judge

Marcia M. Waldron

Marcia M. Waldron, Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Nos. 21-3168 & 21-3380

Novo Nordisk Inc, et al v. United States HHS, et al

(District Court No. 3-21-cv-00806)

CROSS-APPEAL BRIEFING AND SCHEDULING ORDER

Effective December 15, 2008, the Court implemented the Electronic Case Files System. Accordingly, attorneys are required to file all documents electronically. See 3d Cir. L.A.R. 113 (2008) and the Court's CM/ECF website at www.ca3.uscourts.gov/ecfwebsite.

It is **ORDERED** that the first-step brief by Appellant/Cross-Appellee Novo Nordisk Inc and Novo Nordisk Pharma Inc and the joint appendix shall be filed and served on or before **03/08/2022**.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the second-step brief(s) for Appellee/Cross-Appellant Administrator of the Health Resources Services Administration, General Counsel United States Department of Health Human Services, et al. shall be filed and served within thirty (30) days of service of the first-step brief.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the third-step brief, which is the reply brief by Novo Nordisk Inc and Novo Nordisk Pharma Inc Appellant/Cross-Appellee shall be filed and served within thirty (30) days of service of the second-step brief,

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that the fourth-step reply brief which is the reply brief, if any, for Appellee/Cross-Appellant shall be filed and served within twenty-one (21) days of service of third-step brief.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that in the event of default in filing either the first or second -step briefs by the Appellant/Cross-Appellee or the Appellee/Cross-Appellant as directed, the respective appeal may be dismissed without further notice.

This Court requires the filing of briefs by counsel in both electronic and paper format. 3rd Cir. LAR 31 .1(b) . Pro Se litigants are exempt from the electronic filing requirement. **Parties must file 7 copies of the briefs; pro se parties who are proceeding in forma pauperis may file only 4 copies. Costs for additional copies will be permitted only if the Court directs that additional copies be filed.**Pursuant to 3rd Cir. LAR 30.1(a), counsel must electronically file the appendix in accordance with LAR Misc. 113.

It is noted that, where applicable, parties must comply with 3rd Cir. LAR 31.2 which provides: A local, state or federal entity or agency, which was served in the district court and which is the appellee, must file a brief in all cases in which a briefing schedule is issued unless

the court has granted a motion seeking permission to be excused from filing a brief. The rule does not apply to entities or agencies that are respondents to a petition for review, unless the entity or agency is the sole respondent, or to entities or agencies which acted solely as an adjudicatory tribunal.

It is further noted that Fed. R. App. P. 28.1 governs the filing of cross-appeal briefs.

Checklists regarding the requirements for filing a brief and appendix are available on this Court's website at www.ca3.uscourts.gov.

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit,
Clerk

Dated: January 27, 2022

cc:

Daniel J. Aguilar, Esq.
Israel Dahan, Esq.
Ashley C. Parrish, Esq.
Graciela M. Rodriguez, Esq.
John D. Shakow, Esq.