1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
<u>7</u>		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	NATHAN SESSING,	1:13-cv-01684-LJO-MJS (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	AMENDED ORDER:
13	V.	(1) GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S FIRST MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE
14	JEFFREY BEARD, et al.,	OBJECTIONS TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (ECF No. 27)
15	Defendants.	RECOMMENDATIONS (ECF No. 27) (2) DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RULING AS MOOT (ECF No.
16		26)
17		FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
18		
19	This amended order vecetoe and	roplaces the immediately proceding order (ECE
20	This amended order vacates and replaces the immediately preceding order (ECF No. 28) which stated the parties' names incorrectly. The two orders otherwise are the	
21	same in purpose, effect and holding and provide as set out below:	
22	Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42	
23	U.S.C. § 1983. On March 30, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for ruling, requesting that the	
24	Court issue findings and recommendations regarding his Third Amended Complaint	
25	(ECF No. 26.) In fact, the Court issued its findings and recommendations that day. (EC	
26	No. 25.) On April 20, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for a two-week extension of time to file	
27	objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 27). Good cause having	

been presented to the court and GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, IT IS **HEREBY ORDERED that:** (1) Plaintiff is granted fourteen (14) days from the date of service of this order in which to file objections to the findings and recommendations. (2) Plaintiff's motion for ruling (ECF No. 26) is DENIED as moot. (3) The Court's previous order (ECF No. 28) is VACATED. IT IS SO ORDERED. 1st Michael J. Seng Dated: <u>April 24, 2015</u>