

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**

MATTHEW JAMES GRIFFIN,)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-01599-LJO-BAM (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’ EX PARTE
)	APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
v.)	FILE REPLY BRIEFS IN SUPPORT OF
)	DEFENDANTS GONZALES’ AND BUSCH’S
A. JOHNSON, et al.,)	MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
)	
Defendants.)	(ECF No. 152)
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Matthew James Griffin (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff initiated this action on September 30, 2013. (ECF No. 1.) On December 12, 2016, Defendants Gonzales and Busch each filed a motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 141 and 142.) On January 5, 2017, the Court granted Plaintiff a forty-five (45) day extension of time to respond to these motions. (ECF No. 145.) Plaintiff filed his consolidated opposition, which totals more than 200 pages, on February 27, 2017. (ECF Nos. 147, 148 and 149.) Defendants’ replies to the opposition, if any, are due on March 6, 2017. Local Rule 230(l).

1 On March 2, 2017, Defendants filed an ex parte application for a two-week extension of time
2 to file their replies to Plaintiff's opposition to the motions for summary judgment. (ECF No. 152.)
3 Defendants also filed a declaration of counsel in support of the ex parte application. Although Plaintiff
4 has not had an opportunity to respond to Defendants' request, the Court finds a response unnecessary.
5 Local Rule 230(l).

6 The declaration in support of Defendants' application explains that Plaintiff's opposition
7 consists of over two hundred pages of legal argument and evidentiary materials, which will require not
8 only reply briefing, but also extensive evidentiary objections. Counsel also explains that the attorney
9 handling this matter and his associate have been preparing for trial in *Wheeler v. Alison*, Case No.
10 1:12-cv-00861-DAD-GSA, which is scheduled to begin on March 7, 2017, and is expected to last the
11 balance of the week. As a result, counsel does not believe there is a reasonable amount of time to
12 prepare the necessary reply papers by the current deadline. (ECF No. 152.)

13 Having considered the ex parte application, the Court finds good cause to modify the briefing
14 schedule in this matter. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The Court further finds that Plaintiff will not be
15 prejudiced by the brief extension requested here.

16 Accordingly, Defendants' ex parte application for an extension of time, (ECF No. 152), is
17 GRANTED. Defendants' replies in support of their motions for summary judgment are due no later
18 than **March 20, 2017**.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: March 3, 2017

22 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28