

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

GRICELDA FLORES,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00378-CDB (SS)  
ORDER ON STIPULATION EXTENDING  
TIME TO FILE A RESPONSIVE BRIEF  
(Doc. 15)

On March 29, 2024, Plaintiff Gricelda Flores (“Plaintiff”) filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner” or “Defendant”) denying her application for disability insurance and supplemental security income benefits under the Social Security Act. (Doc. 1). Defendant lodged the certified administrative record with the Court on May 28, 2024. (Doc. 11). Plaintiff filed an opening brief on June 27, 2024. (Doc. 12).

Defendant filed a notice of a 30-day extension to respond to Plaintiff’s opening brief on July 26, 2024. (Doc. 14). On the day Defendant’s brief was due, Defendant filed the instant stipulation for a second extension of time. (Doc. 15).

Requests for extensions of time in the Eastern District of California are governed by Local Rule 144, which provides: “Counsel shall seek to obtain a necessary extension from the Court or from other counsel or parties in an action as soon as the need for an extension becomes apparent.”

1 L.R. 144(d). Given counsel for Defendant’s representations concerning the prospect of settlement  
2 discussions and workload, it should have become apparent to Defendant that an extension was  
3 needed, and hence, under Local Rule 144, a request for an extension of time should have been  
4 filed before the day its brief was due. *See id.* (“Requests for Court-approved extensions brought  
5 on the required filing date for the pleading or other document are looked upon with disfavor.”).

6 In light of the parties’ representations, an extension of time is warranted. However, the  
7 Court admonishes Defendant to exercise better care and adherence to this Court’s Local Rules in  
8 all future filings.

9 Accordingly, pursuant to the stipulation of the parties, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that  
10 Defendant’s deadline to file a responsive brief be extended to **September 18, 2024**, and the  
11 Court’s scheduling Order (Doc. 9) shall continue to govern the filing of any reply brief.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: August 28, 2024

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28