UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KRISTEN G. WILSON,	Case No.: 1:11-cv-01238 - JLT
Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME
v.	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security	(Doc. 14)
Defendant.	

On May 3, 2012, the parties filed a stipulation for an extension of time for Plaintiff to file an opening brief. (Doc. 14). The Scheduling Order allows a single thirty-day extension by the stipulation of parties. (Doc. 7-1 at 4). After this extension has been used, "requests to modify [the Scheduling Order] must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause." (*Id.*) Because the parties stipulated to an extension of the briefing schedule on March 5, 2012 (Doc. 12), the Court interprets the parties' stipulation as a motion to modify the scheduling order.

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). According the parties' stipulation, the extension is required because "a portion of the Certified Administrative Record filed with this Court appears to be missing." (Doc. 14 at 1).

Defendant requests a sixty-day extension be granted to allow sufficient time for Defendant to locate the evidence and for Plaintiff to file her opening brief. (*Id.* at 1-2). Accordingly, good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: The parties' request for an extension of time is **GRANTED**; and 1. 2. Plaintiff **SHALL** file her opening brief on or before July 5, 2012. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston May 4, 2012 Dated: UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE