

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**

JEFFREY P. PERROTTE,)	Case No. 1:15-cv-00026-LJO-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF’S
)	OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS’ REQUEST TO
)	MODIFY THE SCHEDULING ORDER
STACEY JOHNSON, et al.,)	
)	[ECF Nos. 104, 107, 109]
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Jeffrey P. Perrotte is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On November 14, 2017, Defendants filed a motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order. (ECF No. 104.) Defendants noted that Plaintiff did not oppose the instant motion. (Id.)

On November 15, 2017, the Court granted Defendants’ request to modify the February 7, 2017 discovery and scheduling order and extended the discovery and dispositive motion deadlines to March 16, 2018 and May 28, 2018, respectively. (ECF No. 107.)

On November 27, 2017, Plaintiff filed objections to Defendants’ November 14, 2017 motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order. (ECF No. 109.) In his objections, Plaintiff states that he opposes any stay of the discovery in this action pending a ruling on Defendants’ motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust the administrative remedies. (Id.) However, in granting Defendants’ motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order, the Court did not stay discovery but rather

1 extended both the discovery and disposition motion deadlines on the basis of good cause and pending
2 a ruling on the exhaustion-related motion for summary judgment. Accordingly, Plaintiff's objection to
3 Defendants' motion to modify the discovery and scheduling order is overruled.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: November 28, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE