1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	KEVIN D. BRYANT,	Case No. 1:12-cv-01377 LJO JLT	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER RE: DEFENDANTS' <i>EX PARTE</i> APPLICATION TO MODIFY BRIEFING	
13	vs.	SCHEDULE	
14	APOTEX, INC., et al.,	(Doc. 46)	
15	Defendants.		
16		_/	
17	On January 17, 2013, Defendants filed an ex parte application to modify the briefing schedule		
18	regarding their motion for judgment on the pleadings. The Court has considered the application and		
19	finds good cause to modify the briefing schedule. Accordingly, Defendants shall file their joint reply		
20	brief by no later than January 25, 2013. Further, in the interest of justice and judicial economy, the		
21	Court will instruct the Clerk of Court to file and docket Plaintiff's opposition papers. <sup>1</sup>		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
27	Dated: <u>January 18, 2013</u>	/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
28			
	<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff served Defendants with his opposition but failed to file the document with the Court. Defendants have,		

however, attached a true copy of Plaintiff's opposition papers to their ex parte application. (Doc. 46-2, Exs. B & C.)

Dockets.Justia.com