

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 JOHN DEREK GITMED, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. 1:16 -cv-00178-DAD-SAB

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT JOHN
GITMED'S MOTION FOR 120 DAY
EXTENSION OF TIME

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT JOHN
GITMED THIRTY (30) DAYS FROM THE
DATE OF SERVICE OF THIS ORDER TO
FILE HIS RESPONSIVE PLEADING

(ECF No. 31)
17

18 On February 8, 2016, plaintiff Eli Lilly filed a complaint in this action against defendants
19 John Derek Gitmed, Holly Gitmed, Felicia Gitmed, and Anthony Pollino, Jr. (ECF No. 1.) On
20 August 3, 2016, defendant John Gitmed filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 27.) On August 9,
21 2016, the Court denied defendant John Gitmed's motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 28.) The Court
22 ordered defendant John Gitmed to file a pleading responsive to the complaint within thirty (30)
23 days from the date of service of this order.

24 On August 29, 2016, defendant John Gitmed filed a motion for an extension of time to
25 file his responsive pleading. (ECF No. 31.) Defendant John Gitmed requests a one hundred
26 twenty (120) day extension of time, or until December 18, 2016, to file his responsive pleading.
27 (ECF No. 31.) Defendant John Gitmed states that the additional time is needed in order to
28 permit him to investigate this claim and to prepare appropriate responsive pleadings. (ECF No.

31.) Defendant John Gitmed did not provide any additional information in his request. Based upon a review of defendant John Gitmed's request for an extension of time, the Court denies defendant John Gitmed's motion for a one hundred twenty day extension of time to file his responsive pleading. However, the Court grants defendant John Gitmed thirty (30) days from the date of service of this order to file his responsive pleading. Defendant John Gitmed is advised that further extensions of time to continue deadlines will only be granted upon a showing of good cause. Specific and detailed showings of good cause are favored over general requests for extensions of time.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant John Gitmed's motion for a one hundred twenty (120) day extension of time to file his responsive pleading is DENIED; and
2. Defendant John Gitmed is granted thirty days (30) from the date of service of this order to file his responsive pleading.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2016


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE