

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

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

MONTE Y. SHAW,)	1:10-cv-02350 JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING THIRTY DAY
)	EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PLAINTIFF TO
v.)	SERVE A CONFIDENTIAL LETTER BRIEF
)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,)	(Doc. 16)
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On November 15, 2011, the parties filed a stipulation for Plaintiff Monte Y. Shaw (“Plaintiff”) to have an extension forty-five days to serve Defendant with a confidential letter brief. (Doc. 16). However, the Scheduling Order entered in this action allows a single *thirty-day* extension by the stipulation of parties. (Doc. 4-1 at 4). Any further requests to modify the Scheduling Order “must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause.” *Id.*

Importantly, a scheduling order “is not a frivolous piece of paper, idly entered, which can be cavalierly disregarded without peril.” *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 610 (9th Cir. 1992). The deadlines are considered “firm, real and are to be taken seriously by parties and their counsel.” *Shore v. Brown*, 74 Fed. R. Serv. 3d (Callaghan) 1260, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94828 at *7 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2009).

The parties fail to explain or demonstrate good cause of an extension beyond the thirty days permitted by stipulation in the Scheduling Order. Consequently, the extension of time is granted for

1 thirty days, rather than the stipulated forty-five days.

2 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**: Plaintiff SHALL serve Defendant with a
3 confidential letter brief on or before **December 15, 2011**.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: November 17, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28