UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIM CORONADO, Jr., Plaintiff, v. COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Defendant.	Case No. 1:15-cv-00806-AWI-SAB ORDER GRANTING IN PART STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO FILE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S OPENING BRIEF (ECF No. 30)

On August 12, 2016, Defendant filed a stipulation for an extension of time to file the opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief. (ECF No. 28.) In Defendant's first stipulation for an extension of time, Defendant stated that the extension was necessary due to Defendant's counsel's workload. (ECF No. 28.) On August 15, 2016, the Court granted Defendant an extension to September 14, 2016, to file the opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief. (ECF No. 29.)

On September 14, 2016, Defendant filed a stipulation for a second extension of time to September 21, 2016, to file the opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief. (ECF No. 30.) Defendant states that an extension is necessary due to workload including a high volume of other disability and employment matters. (ECF No. 30.) Defendant has given the same reason in the second extension of time as she gave in the first extension of time without any new facts supporting an extension of time. Based upon a review of Defendant's stipulation for a second extension of

time, and in light of the fact that Defendant filed the request on the eve of the deadline without an explanation for the delay in seeking an extension, Defendant is granted an extension to September 16, 2016, to file the opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief. Plaintiff's reply, if any, shall be filed on or before October 3, 2016.

The parties are advised that due to the impact of social security cases on the Court's docket and the Court's desire to have cases decided in an expedient manner, requests for modification of the briefing scheduling will not routinely be granted and will only be granted upon a showing of good cause. Further, requests to modify the briefing schedule that are made on the eve of a deadline will be looked upon with disfavor and may be denied absent good cause for the delay in seeking an extension.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's stipulation for a second extension of time to file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief is GRANTED IN PART;
2. Defendant shall file an opposition to Plaintiff's opening brief on or before September 16, 2016; and
3. Plaintiff's reply, if any, shall be filed on or before October 3, 2016.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **September 14, 2016**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE