

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**

AGNES XIE,

Plaintiff,

v.

TURNER DESIGNS HYDRO CARBON  
INSTRUMENTS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

---

Case No. 1:17-cv-00284-LJO-SKO

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

**(Docs. 31 & 36)**

Before the Court are Plaintiff's (1) "Amended Second Motion for Extension of Time to Response [sic] to Motion to Dismiss" (the "Amended Motion"), (Doc. 31), and (2) "Second Motion for Extension of Time for Response [sic] to Dismiss" (the "Second Motion"), (Doc. 36). For good cause shown, the Court GRANTS IN PART the Amended Motion, (Doc. 31), and the Second Motion, (Doc. 36), insofar as Plaintiff requests an extension to file her opposition to the pending motions to dismiss. However, to avoid unreasonable delay in the progress of this case, the Court finds that a sixty day extension—and not Plaintiff's requested ninety day extension—is appropriate. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff may respond to Defendants' motions to dismiss, (Docs. 19 & 20), by no later than October 2, 2017. The Court further ORDERS that Defendants may file their reply briefs, if they so choose, by no later than October 16, 2017.

The Court also notes that Plaintiff filed a "Part 1" opposition to one of the motions to dismiss on July 31, 2017. (*See* Doc. 32.) The Court CAUTIONS Plaintiff that she may file—and

1 the Court will only consider—*one* opposition to each pending motion to dismiss. As such, if  
2 Plaintiff files an additional opposition to this motion to dismiss, (*see* Doc. 19), the Court shall *only*  
3 consider Plaintiff's newly filed opposition and *not* her July 31, 2017 "Part 1" filing.

4 Finally, Plaintiff sent an *ex parte* e-mail to the Court on July 31, 2017, that included a  
5 “protective order” for certain documents associated with Plaintiff’s July 31, 2017 “Part 1” filing.  
6 If Plaintiff files a new opposition to the subject motion to dismiss, (*see* Doc. 19), the Court will  
7 disregard this July 31, 2017 *ex parte* communication. However, if Plaintiff wishes instead to rely  
8 on this “Part 1” filing as her one opposition to this motion to dismiss, then the Court DIRECTS  
9 Plaintiff to file a motion requesting to seal the documents in accordance with Local Rule 141.

10  
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: August 3, 2017

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

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28