

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PATRICIA A. McCOLM,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-cv-00580-RRB

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION**  
**AT DOCKET 28**

At **Docket 28** Plaintiff Patricia A. McColm has moved for an extension of time through January 18, 2017, within which to file her amended complaint, and request relief from the requirement that she pay the filing fee. The Court notes that the record reflects that the Complaint was initially dismissed with leave to amend on March 4, 2015.<sup>1</sup> On March 20, 2015, the Court granted McColm an additional 180 days within which to file her amended complaint.<sup>2</sup> On October 2, 2015, the Court grant a second extension through January 8, 2016.<sup>3</sup> On January 5, 2016, the Court granted a third extension through May 13, 2016.<sup>4</sup> On May 11, 2016, the Court granted a fourth extension though September 12, 2016.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Docket 13.

<sup>2</sup> Docket 19.

<sup>3</sup> Docket 21.

<sup>4</sup> Docket 23.

<sup>5</sup> Docket 26.

McColm sets for several bases necessitating the extension, including: a continuing need for medical evaluation and treatment; failure of her computer/printer; lack of access to records for research; and conflicts with other older time-sensitive matters. While this Court is not unsympathetic to Plaintiff's situation, at this point McColm has already been granted a total in excess of one year within which to file her amended complaint.

The foregoing notwithstanding, the Court will extend the time within which Plaintiff must file her amended complaint and pay the filing fee. Accordingly, on or before **Friday, January 13, 2017**, Plaintiff must comply with the provisions of the Court's Order at **Docket 13**, as modified by the Order at **Docket 19**.

***Plaintiff is warned that further requests for an extension of time will not be looked upon with favor. In the event that Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint and otherwise comply with the provisions of this Order within the time ordered by the Court, the Court may dismiss this action without further notice.***

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 9<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016.

S/ RALPH R. BEISTLINE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE