

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

LUCY ATAYDE,
Plaintiff,
v.
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00398-DAD-SAB
ORDER DENYING STIPULATION FOR
ORDER SHORTENING TIME
(ECF No. 130)

On May 14, 2019, Intervenor Ai Qiong Zhong, W.L., and Mai Chau (“Intervenors”), who are plaintiffs in a related matter, filed a motion to intervene for the purpose of modifying the protective order entered in this matter in order to obtain certain discovery. (ECF No. 128.) On May 14, 2019, the Intervenor also filed a stipulation for an order shortening the time to hear the motion to intervene. (ECF No. 130.) The Court notes that the stipulation appears to only be signed on behalf of the Intervenor, and some, but not all, of the Defendants in this matter. (ECF No. 130.) Additionally, the filing does not comply with the Local Rules pertaining to applications to shorten time, which requires such applications to “set forth by affidavit of counsel the circumstances claimed to justify the issuance of an order shortening time.” L.R. 144(e). Further, “[e]x parte applications to shorten time will not be granted except upon affidavit of counsel showing a satisfactory explanation for the need for the issuance of such an order and for the failure of counsel to obtain a stipulation for the issuance of such an order from other counsel

1 or parties in the action.” Id.

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the stipulation requesting an order
3 shortening time (ECF No. 130) is DENIED without prejudice.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: May 21, 2019


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28