| 1 | | |
|----------|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 6 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 10 | DOUGAL SAMUELS, | Case No. 1:10-cv-00585-DAD-EPG (PC) |
| 10 11 | Plaintiff, | ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO COUNTY |
| 11 | V. | DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR BRIEF EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE ANSWER |
| 12 | PAM AHLIN, et al., | (ECF NO. 108) |
| 13 | Defendants. | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | On October 15, 2018, the County Defend | lants filed a motion for an extension of time in |
| 17 | which to file their answer. (ECF No. 106). As there is a pending motion for reconsideration of | |
| 18 | the order denying their motion to dismiss, the County Defendants asked that they be given five | |
| 19 | days from the date of the Court's ruling on the motion for reconsideration to file their answer, | |
| 20 | unless a different time frame is stated in the ruling. | |
| 21 | On October 17, 2018, the Court granted the County Defendants' request. (ECF No. 107). | |
| 22 | On October 25, 2018, Plaintiff filed objections to the County Defendants' Request. (ECF | |
| 23 | No. 108). Plaintiff appears to argue that the request is moot because his request for an extension | |
| 24 | of time to object to the findings and recommendations was denied. However, the County | |
| 25 | Defendants' request for an extension of time to file their answer is not related to Plaintiff's | |
| 26 | request for an extension of time to respond to objections that were already overruled. Thus, the | |
| 27 | County Defendants' request for an extension is not moot. | |
| 28 | 1 | |
| | | - |

| 1 | Plaintiff also argues that the County Defendants should not be allowed to request | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | reconsideration of District Judge Dale A. Drozd's order denying the County Defendants' motion | |
| 3 | to dismiss. However, the request for an extension of time relates to when the County Defendants | |
| 4 | must file their answer. The legal issue regarding whether reconsideration is proper is before | |
| 5 | Judge Drozd in the motion for reconsideration. | |
| 6 | Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections to the County Defendants' request | |
| 7 | for an extension of time are OVERRULED. | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 10 | Dated: October 26, 2018 /s/ Encir P. Group | |
| 11 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | 2 | |
| | | |