

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
FRESNO DIVISION

AMERICAN SPECIALTY HEALTH
INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICAN SPECIALTY
HEALTHCARE, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-01203-DAD-SKO

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF
AMERICAN SPECIALTY HEALTH
INCORPORATED’S NOTICE OF
MOTION AND UNOPPOSED MOTION
FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR
DEFENDANTS AMERICAN SPECIALTY
HEALTHCARE, INC., ET AL. TO
ANSWER OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO
COMPLAINT**

(Doc. 10)

Date: November 1, 2017
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Ctm: 7, 6th Floor
Judge: Hon. Magistrate Judge Sheila K. Oberto

Plaintiff American Specialty Health Incorporated (“Plaintiff”) filed its complaint on September 6, 2017. (Doc. 1.) Defendants American Specialty Healthcare, Inc., American College LLC, Gurpreet Singh, and Gia Smith (collectively, “Defendants”) were served on September 12, 2017. (Docs. 5–8.) Defendants’ responsive pleadings were therefore due twenty-one (21) days after service, or October 3, 2017. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)(i). That same day, Plaintiff filed its “Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time for Defendants to Answer or Otherwise Respond to Complaint” (the “Motion”). (Doc. 9.)

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

Requests for extension are governed by Rule 144 of the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California (“Local Rules”). Local Rule 144(d) explains that “[r]equests for Court-approved extensions brought on the required filing date for the pleading or other document are looked upon with disfavor.” The parties are hereby admonished that any future requests for extensions of time shall be brought in advance of the required filing date. However, given that Plaintiff consents to a 30-day extension of time for Defendants to respond to the complaint (as evidenced by the fact that *Plaintiff* is the movant), the Court GRANTS the Motion. Accordingly, Defendants have up to and including November 2, 2017, to respond to Plaintiff’s complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 5, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE