

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NATHAN HANSFORD,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-02232 MCE KJN

v.

SOLANO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES and
DOES ONE THROUGH FIFTY, inclusive,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

In an order signed on July 15, 2011, and docketed on July 18, 2011, the undersigned partially granted defendant’s ex parte request for an extension of time relative to the undersigned’s previously entered discovery order. (See Order, July 18, 2011, Dkt. No. 67; see also Order, June 17, 2011, Dkt. No. 60.) The order addressing defendant’s ex parte request was executed and transmitted for docketing before plaintiff filed an opposition to defendant’s request; plaintiff filed a written opposition late on Friday, July 15, 2011 (Dkt. No. 65).

The court has considered plaintiff’s written opposition to defendant’s ex parte request, construing it as a motion for reconsideration by the undersigned. Notwithstanding plaintiff’s written opposition and understandable frustration regarding the delays caused in this case by defendant, the undersigned’s July 15, 2011 order stands. As noted in that prior order, the

1 undersigned was able to rule on defendant's request absent plaintiff's written opposition,
2 especially in light of the representations made by defendant and its counsel under penalty of
3 perjury. Plaintiff's written opposition does not persuade the undersigned to alter the July 15,
4 2011 order.


5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

6 1. Plaintiff's written opposition to defendant's ex parte application for relief
7 (Dkt. No. 65) is construed as an application for reconsideration.

8 2. Plaintiff's application for reconsideration by the undersigned is denied.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: July 18, 2011

11
12 
13 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26