

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

FRANCISCO MENDOZA,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOLDEN VALLEY HEALTH CENTERS, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-01611-DAD-SAB

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

(ECF No. 5)

DEADLINE: JULY 5, 2017

On May 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file a first amended complaint. (ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff seeks an extension so that he can receive documents from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”).

The Court will grant Plaintiff’s request for an extension of time, but Plaintiff is advised that he does not need his EEOC documents to file his amended complaint. A complaint must contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief. . . .” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). At the pleading stage, Plaintiff’s factual allegations are accepted as true and to survive screening Plaintiff’s claims must be facially plausible, which requires sufficient factual detail to allow the Court to reasonably infer that each named defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); Moss v. U.S. Secret Service, 572 F.3d 962, 969 (9th Cir. 2009).

