UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RUDY MARTINEZ, JR.,) Case No.: 1:15-cv-00797- JLT
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,) (Doc. 15)
Defendant.))

On March 3, 2013, 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. 5 at 4, emphasis added) This extension was used previously by Plaintiff, who requested an extension of time to serve the confidential letter brief. (Docs. 11-12) 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. 5 at 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 she has "a heavy work load despite best efforts," and was unable to comply with the filing deadline of March 4, 2016 (Doc. 15 at 2) Defendant does not oppose an extension of time. (*Id.*)

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time is **GRANTED**; Plaintiff SHALL serve her opening brief no later than April 13, 2016; and 2. Plaintiff is cautioned that no further extensions will be granted without the showing of 3. exceptionally good cause. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: March 7, 2016