



1 pleading stage. He fails to demonstrate any prejudice to him that the 19-day extension would impose  
2 and seems to ignore that it was his decision to amend his complaint that gave rise to the delay now at  
3 issue.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 4 1. The plaintiff's objection (Doc. 13) to the extension request is **OVERRULED**;
- 5 2. The defendant's request for the extension of time (Doc. 12) is **GRANTED IN PART**.

6 The responsive pleading **SHALL** be filed no later than December 8, 2020. The Court declines to set a  
7 briefing on a motion that has not been filed and, in fact, as to which there is no certainty will be filed.  
8 If a motion to dismiss is filed, the normal rules related to opposing and replying to the opposition  
9 remain in place.<sup>3</sup>

10  
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: **November 17, 2020**

13 **/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston**  
14 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>2</sup> Because the plaintiff refused to stipulate to the extension, the Court was required to address his unsupported objections  
28 despite the significant number of other cases also needing urgent attention. In future, counsel **SHALL** extend courtesy to  
their opponent unless doing so would prejudice the client.

<sup>3</sup> Moreover, because the plaintiff is concerned about delay, the proposed briefing scheduling, which inflates the normal time periods, is inconsistent with this concern.