

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY BERTRAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. SIZELOVE, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-00583-AWI-GBC (PC)

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
FILE RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF’S
MOTIONS

Docs. 84, 85, 86, 92

DEADLINE: AUGUST 29, 2012

On July 30, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for the District Judge to preside over all further proceedings and two motions for sanctions against Defendants for failure to comply with a court order. Docs. 84, 85, 86. On August 6, 2012, Plaintiff filed an amended opposition to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. Doc. 89. On August 9, 2012, Defendants filed an amended reply. Doc. 90. On August 15, 2012, Defendants filed a motion for extension time to file responses to Plaintiff’s three motions. Doc. 92. In Defendants’ motion, counsel states that the documents Plaintiff served on Defendants differ from the documents filed with the Court. *Id.* Defendants expended considerable time in filing a timely reply to Plaintiff’s amended opposition, which prevented them from addressing Plaintiff’s three motions. *Id.* The Court HEREBY GRANTS Defendants’ motion for extension time to file responses to Plaintiff’s three motions.

Defendants have until **August 29, 2012** to file responses to Plaintiff’s three motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 16, 2012


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE