

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

JENNIFER DOE and NANCY DOE,  
  
                                Plaintiffs,  
  
                                v.  
  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
  
                                Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00337-KES-CDB  
  
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’  
REQUESTED EXTENSION OF TIME TO  
RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT AS  
MODIFIED  
  
(Doc. 1)  
  
ORDER VACATING SCHEDULING  
CONFERENCE

**Background**

Plaintiffs Jennifer Doe and Nancy Doe, state inmates proceeding through counsel, initiated this action with the filing of a complaint in the California Superior Court for the County of Madera, alleging, among other things, violations of their rights by Defendants State of California and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”) under the Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. (Doc. 1 p. 1).

Defendants removed the action to this Court on March 21, 2024. (Doc. 1). In their notice of removal, Defendants request the Court screen Plaintiffs’ complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and grant Defendants 30 days to respond to the complaint from the date of service of the Court’s order screening the complaint. *Id.* at 3.

Defendants’ request for an extension of time to respond to the complaint after service of the Court’s screening order will be granted. The Court shall proceed with screening Plaintiff’s complaint and acknowledges that the screening process is expected to be time consuming given

1 that the complaint spans over 45 pages and raises 21 counts against multiple defendants.

2 **Conclusion and Order**

3 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

4 1. Defendant shall have 21 days to respond to the complaint from the date of service of the  
5 Court's order screening the complaint. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)(i).

6 2. To allow for screening of the complaint and filing of a responsive pleading, the  
7 scheduling conference set for June 17, 2024 (Doc. 2) is HEREBY VACATED to be reset once  
8 the pleadings have settled.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: March 27, 2024

11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28