

1 through their respective undersigned counsel that pursuant to Local Rule 144(a),
2 the time in which Defendant Paul Grenseman may respond to Plaintiffs'
3 complaint be extended until September 2, 2016. This extension of time is due to
4 the fact that Defendant Grenseman will need time to secure trial counsel to
5 represent him as present Counsel (Law Offices of Melo and Sarsfield LLP) has a
6 conflict.

7
8
9 /s/ Christine Garcia

10 Dated: August 12, 2016

11 Christine Garcia, Esq.
12 Attorney for Plaintiffs Wendy Jones, Brian
13 Jones and William Fabricius

14
15
16 Dated: August 12, 2016

LAW OFFICES OF MELO AND
SARFIELD, LLP

19 /s/ John Sarsfield

20 By: _____
21 John Sarsfield, Esq.
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff

23
24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

ORDER

Based on the above stipulation, Defendant Paul Genseman may file his responsive pleading to the First Amended Complaint no later than **September 2, 2016**. The Court notes that Plaintiffs and all Defendants except for Defendant Genseman have consented to the jurisdiction of a United States Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). (ECF Nos. 26, 29.) Defendant Genseman is thus **DIRECTED** to either consent or decline to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction no later than **September 2, 2016**. The hearing on the Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 34) and Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 37), currently set for September 2, 2016, is **TAKEN OFF CALENDAR** and will be re-set for hearing after the Court has received Defendant Genseman's responsive pleading(s) and consent/decline form. The briefing schedule for these motions remains unchanged; filing deadlines for the opposition and reply briefs remain as dictated by the noticed hearing date (*i.e.*, September 2, 2016) and Local Rule 230(c) and (d).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 17, 2016

/s/ Eric P. Gray
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE