

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**

BRADLEY JENNINGS LITTLE,

Case No. 1:16-cv-00846-SKO

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
EXTENSION**

v.

**(Doc. 15)**

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

---

On May 2, 2017, the parties filed a joint Stipulation and Proposed Order for a First Extension of Time for Defendant to File Her Responsive Brief (the “Request”), in which the parties request an “extension of time of 30 days” for Defendant “to file her responsive brief.” (Doc. 15.) The stated bases for the Request are that defense counsel “improperly calendar[ed] the deadlines in this case” and has “a very heavy workload.” (*Id.*)

The Court notes that Defendant’s responsive brief was due *over one month* prior to the parties filing the Request, (*see* Docs. 5 & 12)—something the parties fail to address in the Request, (*see* Doc. 15). As the Court recently noted in an analogous situation, “Defendant was free to timely request an extension prior to the current deadline . . . , regardless of the volume of defense counsel’s workload.” *Colston v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, Case No. 1:15-cv-01750-SKO, 2017 WL 784870, at \*1 n.1 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2017). “The Court will not now grant [an] extension where Defendant waited for over one month after this deadline to seek such relief.” *Id.*

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

For these reasons, the Court DENIES the Request. (Doc. 15.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 9, 2017

*/s/ Sheila K. Oberto*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE