

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

HANFORD EXECUTIVE)	1:11-cv-00828-AWI-DLB
MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEE)	
ASSOCIATION, CATHY CAIN, LOUIS)	ORDER DENYING EX PARTE
CAMARA, GEORGE THOMAS DIBBLE,)	APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION
TIMOTHY IERONIMO, MARY ROSE)	OF TIME TO FILE FIRST
LINDSAY, CARLOS MESTAS,)	AMENDED COMPLAINT
SCOTT YEAGER,)	
)	(Doc. 43)
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	
CITY OF HANFORD, HILARY STRAUS,)	
DAN CHIN, SUE SORENSEN, JIM)	
IRWIN, LOU MARTINEZ,)	
JOLEEN JAMESON,)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiffs Hanford Executive Management Employee Association et al. have filed an ex parte application for extension of time to file a first amended complaint. Having reviewed the pleadings of record and all competent and admissible evidence submitted, including the declaration of Jason H. Jasmine, the Court finds Plaintiffs have failed to establish good cause for an extension under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b). Plaintiffs first contend they are “presently evaluating their appellate options,” presumably in reference to the Court’s November 17, 2011 and/or February 23, 2012 orders dismissing the complaint and denying reconsideration of the dismissal, respectively, and

1 that “[f]iling an amended complaint . . . may potentially have an impact on appeal[.]” Plaintiffs have
2 provided no authority – and the Court’s research reveals no authority – to suggest such reasons could
3 conceivably constitute good cause. Plaintiffs further contend they are “also assessing which portions
4 of the complaint to amend.” The Court notes Plaintiffs have had nearly four months – since entry
5 of the Court’s November 17, 2011 order dismissing their complaint – to file an amended complaint,
6 which is significantly more than the thirty days the Court typically affords litigants. Under these
7 circumstances, additional time to amend is unwarranted. *See State of California ex rel. Mueller v.*
8 *Walgreen Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 638, 639-40 (N.D.Cal. 1997). Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ ex parte
9 application for extension of time to file a first amended complaint is DENIED.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 12, 2012

12 
13 _____
14 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28