

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ALBERTO VILLESICAS,)	Case No.: 1:12-cv-02068-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME AND MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD
M.T. DOTSON, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	[ECF Nos. 48, 49]
)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Alberto Villescas is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), Plaintiff consented to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge. Local Rule 302.

On June 4, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery. (ECF No. 43.) Defendants filed an opposition on June 22, 2015. (ECF No. 44.)

On July 16, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s denial of Plaintiff’s third request for an extension of the discovery deadline. (ECF No. 47.)

On July 22, 2015, the undersigned issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion to compel and motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 50.) The July 22, 2015, order was docketed on the Court’s Case Management Electronic filing system on July 23, 2015, and served on the parties. (ECF No. 50.)

1 On July 22, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file a reply to Defendants'
2 opposition to Plaintiff's motion to compel, along with a motion to supplement the record. (ECF Nos.
3 48, 49.)

4 Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time shall be denied as untimely. Plaintiff's reply to
5 Defendants' opposition filed on June 22, 2015, was due seven days thereafter, on June 29, 2015.
6 Local Rule 230(l). Even with the benefit of the mailbox rule, Plaintiff's motion for an extension of the
7 reply deadline was not filed July 19, 2015-20 days after the expiration of the deadline. Thus,
8 Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time is untimely, and the Court properly issued its ruling on July
9 22, 2015, in accordance with Local Rule 230(l). In addition, Plaintiff's motion to supplement the
10 record is a verbatim copy of Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration filed on July 16, 2015, which was
11 denied on July 22, 2015, and shall therefore be denied as duplicative. (ECF No. 47.)

12 Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file a reply is DENIED as untimely; and
- 14 2. Plaintiff's motion to supplement the record is DENIED as duplicative of the motion
15 filed on July 16, 2015.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: August 4, 2015


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE