

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**

JANET DAVIS,)	Case No.: 1:14-cv-01632- JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST
)	FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
v.)	
)	(Doc. 18)
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

On August 3, 2015, the parties filed an amended stipulation to extend time for Plaintiff to file an opening brief. (Doc. 18) Importantly, the scheduling order in this action allows for “a *single* thirty (30) day extension” by stipulation of the parties. (Doc. 7 at 4, emphasis added) This extension was used previously by Defendant, who requested an extension of time on April 16, 2015. (Docs. 12-13) 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.” (Doc. 7at 4) Further, the parties are cautioned that “[r]equests for modification of th[e] briefing schedule will **not** be routinely granted. (*Id.*, emphasis in original) Therefore, the Court construes the stipulation of the parties to be a motion by Plaintiff for modification of the Court’s Scheduling Order.

Here, Plaintiff’s counsel asserts the further extension of time is necessary “because Plaintiff’s counsel is in the process of resolving a backlog in her workload.” (Doc. 18 at 1) Further, Defendant does not oppose the extension of time. (*Id.* at 2)

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

Good cause appearing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time is **GRANTED**;
2. Plaintiff **SHALL** serve her opening brief no later than **September 21, 2015**; and
3. Plaintiff is cautioned that no further extensions will be granted without the showing of exceptionally good cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 20, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE