

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

PAVEL KOVALENKO,)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-0166 - JLT
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME
NANCY A. BERRYHILL,)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)	
Defendant.)	

On March 8, 2018, the parties filed a stipulation for a second extension of time, for Defendant to file response to Plaintiff’s opening brief. (Doc. 22) The Scheduling Order allows for a single extension of thirty days by the stipulation of the parties (Doc. 10-1 at 4).

Further requests for an extension “must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause.” (Doc. 10-1 at 4) Accordingly, the Court construes the stipulation of the parties to be a motion to amend the Scheduling Order. Defendant asserts the additional extension is necessary for counsel to “to review the record, to evaluate the extensive issues raised in Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, to determine whether options exist for settlement, to prepare Defendant’s response to Plaintiff’s Motion if settlement is not possible, and to accommodate other workload demands.” (Doc. 22 at 1-2) Plaintiff does not oppose the request for a further extension, and it does not appear Plaintiff would suffer any prejudice through the delay.

Based upon the stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing, the Court **ORDERS:**

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

1. Defendant's request for a second extension of time is **GRANTED**; and
2. Defendant **SHALL** file a response to the opening brief no later than **April 28, 2018**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 13, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE