

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

RASHAD KING,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
S. HOLLAND, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-01885-DAD-BAM (PC)  
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' EX  
PARTE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION  
OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL  
(ECF No. 55)  
**OPPOSITION DUE ON OR BEFORE  
OCTOBER 6, 2017**

Plaintiff Rashad King ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action currently proceeds on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims against Defendants Duncan, Holland, and Tingley.

On August 17, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for an order compelling discovery. (ECF No. 53.) Defendants' oppositions or statements of non-opposition, if any, were due on September 7, 2017. Local Rule 230(l).

On September 1, 2017, Defendants filed an ex parte application for a thirty-day enlargement of time to file their opposition to Plaintiff's motion to compel, up to and including October 6, 2017. Defendants also filed a declaration of counsel in support of the ex parte application. Although Plaintiff has not had an opportunity to respond to Defendants' request, the Court finds a response unnecessary. Local Rule 230(l).

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

The declaration in support of Defendants’ application explains that Plaintiff’s motion does not identify which discovery responses he is seeking to compel, and appears to seek documents that were not responsive to his discovery requests. Counsel also explains that she has been preparing filings in various cases since the motion was filed, and is therefore unable to timely complete the opposition. (ECF No. 55.)

Having considered the ex parte application, the Court finds good cause to modify the briefing schedule in this matter. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). The Court further finds that Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the brief extension requested here.

Accordingly, Defendants’ ex parte application for an extension of time, (ECF No. 55), is GRANTED. Defendants’ opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to compel is due no later than **October 6, 2017**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 11, 2017

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE