

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

MERCEDES MORALES DE ROMERO,)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-01508 - JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF’S
)	REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
v.)	
)	(Doc. 13)
NANCY A. BERRYHILL,)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

On July 5, 2018, the parties filed a stipulation for Plaintiff to have an extension of time to file an opening brief. (Doc. 13) The Scheduling Order allows for a single extension of thirty days by the stipulation of the parties (Doc. 5 at 4). Here, Plaintiff requests an extension of 44 days.

Beyond the single extension of thirty days, “requests to modify [the scheduling] order must be made by written motion and will be granted only for good cause.” (Doc. 5 at 4) Accordingly, the Court construes the stipulation of the parties to be a motion to amend the Scheduling Order. Plaintiff contends the additional time is necessary for counsel “to fully research the issues presented.” (Doc. 13 at 2) In addition, Defendant does not oppose the extension of 44 days. (*See id.* at 1-2)

///
///
///

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

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

1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time is **GRANTED**; and
2. Plaintiff **SHALL** file an opening brief no later than **August 7, 2018**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 9, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE