



May 20, 2011

**VIA FACSIMILE**

The Honorable Denise D. Reilly  
Hennepin County District Court  
300 S. 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55487

Re: Moore v. Hoff *et al* (27-CV-09-17778)

Dear Judge Reilly:

Plaintiff does not agree with the Society's attempt to characterize Plaintiff's foregoing motion to strike as a "response" – thereby making the Society's latest filing a "reply." It appears that is the Society's way of trying to have the last word.

However, Plaintiff does not really think a reply brief is necessary. (It appears that the only law cited by the Society in support of its notion that it can file a *district court* amicus brief is a California case. The rest is merely attacks on Plaintiff counsel which don't merit any response.)

Plaintiff is fine with the Court deciding the issue based on the papers filed to date.

Sincerely,



Jill Clark

JEC/PMK  
Enclosure

c: Original to civil filing; Client; Paul Godfread, Esq.; John Borger, Esq. (non-party, non-intervenor counsel).

**JILL CLARK, P.A. ATTORNEY AT LAW**