IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Virgil E. Holt, Plaintiff, vs. D. G. Stockman, et al., Defendants.	No. CV 1-04-6073-MHM **ORDER**

Pending before the Court are several motions filed by Plaintiff. The Court has reviewed each motion and the applicable law and now enters its ruling.

Plaintiff has filed a "Request That the Court Except (sic) Late Filing of the Attached Motion to Compel." Good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED granting said motion. (Doc. 172)

Plaintiff has filed a "Motion and Request for Reconsideration of the Court's [May 10, 2001] Order denying his Motion for Additional Discovery to Oppose Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment." Plaintiff having filed his Opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, the Court finds no basis to reconsider its prior decision. Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion and Request for Reconsideration of the Court's May 10, 2001 Order. (Doc. 173)

Plaintiff has filed two related motions: a "Request for Leave to File Response to Reply Brief in Support of Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Defendants' Objections to Plaintiff's Evidence Submitted in Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment" (Doc. 174), and a "Request for Leave (and an Extension of Time) to Amend and Supplement Plaintiff's Opposition to the Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Nunc Pro Tunc" (Doc. 180). Plaintiff asserts that he wishes to correct certain mistakes that have been pointed out by Defendants as well as present new arguments in support of his Opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion. Plaintiff has had a full opportunity to respond to Defendants' summary judgment motion. A sur-reply is neither contemplated by Local Rule 78-230(l) nor warranted in these circumstances. Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying said motions. (Docs. 174, 180)

Plaintiff has also filed a Request for an Extension of Time to File a Reply to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Revised Motion to Compel. Plaintiff's proffered reason - that he has been otherwise engaged in preparing for litigation with respect to two other cases he has filed - does not constitute good cause for an extension of time. Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Request for an Extension of Time. (Doc. 181)

Dated this 21st day of September, 2011.

Mary H. Murguia
U.S. Circuit Court Judge
Designated as United States District Judge