UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RENO RIOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

GIPSON, et al,

Defendants.

1:12-cv-01334-LJO-SKO (PC)

ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND FOR REPLY

(Doc. 119)

Defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment on the merits of Plaintiff's claims in this action which is presently pending before the Court. (Doc. 88.) Plaintiff filed an opposition (Docs. 111-115) and Defendants filed a motion seeking a 60-day extension of time to file their reply (Doc. 116). Rather than granting Defendants the requested extension of time, they were ordered to file a supplement to their motion, which has been filed and served on Plaintiff. (Docs. 117, 119.) Plaintiff may supplement his opposition to address the additional evidence Defendants submitted.

It has been several months since Plaintiff received information on the requirements to oppose a motion for summary judgment. Thus, he is provided them again herewith. Defendants' motion has been pending for an excessive amount of time and both parties are granted deadlines exceeding those stated in the Local Rules, *see* L.R. 230(l). Hence no further extensions of time will be granted.

/ / /

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. **within thirty (30) days** of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff **SHALL** file either a supplement to his opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment, or a statement that he stands on his previously submitted opposition;
2. if Defendants desire to file a reply, they **SHALL** do so **within fourteen (14) days** of the date Plaintiff's supplemental opposition or statement is filed; and
3. the Clerk of the Court is directed to serve Plaintiff with a copy of the Second Informational Order, that issued on February 5, 2018, (Doc. 91).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 1, 2018**

/s/ *Sheila K. Oberto*
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE