

1 MOJI SANIEFAR, Cal. Bar. No. 233330
SANIEFAR LAW
2 7469 Mission St., 2nd Fl.
Daly City, CA 94014
3 Tel: (650) 581-0025
moji@saniefarlaw.com
4

SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
5 A Limited Liability Partnership
Including Professional Corporations
6 ROBERT ROSE, Cal. Bar No. 62599
RAYMOND C. MARSHALL, Cal. Bar No. 83717
7 HAYLEY S. GRUNVALD, Cal. Bar No. 227909
8 rrose@sheppardmullin.com
rmarshall@sheppardmullin.com
9 hgrunvald@sheppardmullin.com
12275 El Camino Real, Suite 200
10 San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: 858.720.8900
11 Facsimile: 858.509.3691

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff FATEMEH SANIEFAR

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 FRESNO DIVISION

16 FATEMEH SANIEFAR,
17 Plaintiff,
18 vs.
19 RONALD D. MOORE, TANYA E. MOORE,
KENNETH RANDOLPH MOORE,
20 MAREJKA SACKS, ELMER LEROY FALK,
ZACHARY M. BEST, MOORE LAW FIRM,
21 a California Professional Corporation,
MISSION LAW FIRM, a California
22 Professional Corporation, GEOSHUA
LEVINSON, RICK D. MOORE, WEST
23 COAST CASP AND ADA SERVICES, a
California Corporation, RONNY LORETO,
24 and DOES 1 THROUGH 100, inclusive,
25 Defendants.
26

Case No. 1:17-cv-00823-LJO-BAM
**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
UNOPPOSED EX PARTE APPLICATION
TO CONTINUE THE HEARING ON
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, SUMMARY
ADJUDICATION PURSUANT TO RULES
56(d) or 6(b) AND LOCAL RULE 144(c)**
Noticed Hearing Date
Date: November 14, 2019
Requested Hearing Date
Date: December 20, 2019

Trial Date: May 5, 2020
[Filed Concurrently with Ex Parte Application
and Order]

1 This Court has read and considered the papers submitted by the Parties in connection with
2 Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Application to Continue the Hearing on Defendants' Motion for Summary
3 Judgment be granted. ECF Nos. 220 & 225. The Court finds good cause to grant the motion
4 primarily because Plaintiff has indicated her intent to file a cross motion by the established
5 dispositive filing deadline of November 22, 2019. For reasons of judicial efficiency, it therefore
6 makes sense to continue the deadlines related to Defendants' motion so the cross motions can be
7 decided together. Although Defendants do not agree with the factual premise(s) offered by
8 Plaintiffs in support of the application to continue, Defendants nonetheless do not oppose a
9 continuance. Therefore, the Court orders the following:

- 10 (i) That the hearing on Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment be continued to
11 December 20, 2019 and
12 (ii) That Plaintiff's Opposition thereto is due on or before December 6, 2019.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: October 17, 2019

15 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
16 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE