

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**

MARCUS ANTHONY LOPEZ,	)	Case No.: 1:14-cv-00495- JLT
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S SECOND
	)	EXTENSION OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	(Doc. 22)
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

On January 21, 2015, the parties stipulated for Defendant to have an extension of time file a response to Plaintiff’s opening brief. (Doc. 22.) Importantly, the Scheduling Order allows for “a single thirty (30) day extension” by stipulation of the parties. (Doc. 9 at 4.) Beyond the single thirty-day extension, “requests to modify [the scheduling] order must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause.” (*Id.*) This is the third request for an extension of time filed by the parties in this action, and the Court construes the stipulation to be a motion to amend the Schedule.

Defendant’s counsel requests the extension because “counsel for Defendant is responsible for preparing four substantive briefs in the next ten days, and an extension would alleviate this workload congestion.” (Doc. 22 at 1.) The Court will grant Defendant’s request for a further extension of time because Plaintiff does not oppose the request. **However, the parties are cautioned that no further extensions of time will be granted without a showing of exceptional good cause.**

///

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

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 1. Defendant’s request for an extension of time is **GRANTED**; and
- 2. Defendant **SHALL** a response to Plaintiff’s opening brief on or before **March 30, 2015**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 26, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE