

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**

MOSES FLORES,

Case No. 1:17-cv-00396-LJO-SKO

Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

v.

RED ROBIN,

**(Doc. 6)**

Defendant.

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Request for Extension of Time to File Amended Complaint (the “Motion”),<sup>1</sup> in which Plaintiff requests (1) “a 120 day extension of time” to file an amended complaint, and (2) that the Court “clarify the reasons for its dismissal” of Plaintiff’s prior complaint. (Doc. 6.) As to Plaintiff’s first request, the Court finds that an extension is warranted, although not the full 120 days requested by Plaintiff. The Court therefore GRANTS IN PART the Motion, (Doc. 6), and ORDERS that Plaintiff may file an amended complaint, if he so chooses, by no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Order.

Regarding Plaintiff’s second request, the Court finds that its April 24, 2017 order adequately described the deficiencies in Plaintiff’s prior complaint. In particular, the Court directs

---

<sup>1</sup> The Motion is labeled on the docket for this case as a “Motion for 30-Day Extension of Time to File Amended Complaint.” However, this label does not accurately reflect the title of the Motion, as provided by Plaintiff, or the substance of Plaintiff’s requests in the Motion. (See Doc. 6.) The Court therefore DIRECTS the Clerk to alter the label for the Motion on the docket for this case to the title provided by Plaintiff on the Motion—namely, a “Motion for Extension of Time to File Amended Complaint.”

1 Plaintiff's attention to the requirements of a claim for disparate pay under the Equal Pay Act, (*see*  
2 Doc. 3 at 5–6), as well as the specific deficiencies in Plaintiff's prior Complaint, (*see id.* at 6–7).  
3 The Court therefore DENIES the Motion, (Doc. 6), insofar as Plaintiff requests further  
4 clarification of the Court's April 24, 2017 order.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: May 31, 2017

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

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