

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

ALVARO QUEZADA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
SHERMAN, et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 1:18-cv-00797 DAD JLT (PC)  
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S FIRST  
MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE FIRST  
AMENDED COMPLAINT NUNC PRO TUNC  
(Doc. 14)  
ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO  
EXCEED THE 20 PAGE LIMIT  
(Doc. 16)  
ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
STATUS  
(Doc. 17)

On December 14, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to file the First Amended Complaint, (Doc. 14), which was filed on December 26, 2018, (Doc. 15). Along with the FAC, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking permission for the FAC to exceed the 20-page limit. (Doc. 16.) On January 18, 2019, Plaintiff filed a motion for status of the FAC. (Doc. 17.)<sup>1</sup>

The FAC was filed only a few days after the date it was due. (Compare Doc. 13 & Doc. 15.) Accordingly, Plaintiff’s request for an extension of time is granted nunc pro tunc. Similarly, though Plaintiff filed hundreds of pages of exhibits to the FAC, his allegations are 22 pages in length, (*see* Doc. 15, pp. 9-31), exceeding the 20-page limit by a mere 2 pages which will be

---

<sup>1</sup> Though filed on different dates, the latter two motions, (Docs. 16 & 17), were not entered on the docket for the Court to see until January 18, 2019.

1 allowed just this once. The FAC has been placed in line for screening. Finally, Plaintiff's motion  
2 for status is granted in as much as this order resolves his request.<sup>2</sup> All further requests from  
3 Plaintiff inquiring into the status of this case shall not be filed; if errantly filed, they will be  
4 summarily stricken.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: January 22, 2019

7 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

---

<sup>2</sup> As stated in the First Informational Order, “[t]his Court screens pro se plaintiffs’ complaints as expeditiously as possible. However, the Court has an extremely large number of pro se plaintiff civil rights cases pending before it, and delay is inevitable. As long as a party keeps the Court informed of the party's current address, the Court will provide notice of all actions which might affect the case as soon as an action is taken in the case. The Court will not respond in writing to individual inquiries regarding the status of a case.” (Doc. 3, pp. 3-4.)