

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

BIBI RAKHSANA HAYEE,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:09-cv-02285 KJN

vs.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of Social Security,

ORDER

Defendant.

_____/

On May 10, 2010, counsel for plaintiff filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Extending Plaintiff’s Time to respond to Defendant’s Answer. (Dkt. No. 20.) This request for an extension of time was filed on the date plaintiff’s response was due. The proposed order attached to this stipulation stated that the stipulation showed “good cause,” and that it was a “first extension” of time.

Yet, the accompanying stipulation does not affirmatively show good cause, and in fact fails to articulate a specific basis for the request for an extension of time. Furthermore, the request for an extension of time is not a first request, but is a second request for an extension.¹ A


¹ Additionally, the request fails to recognize that this case was transferred to the undersigned on February 9, 2010. Hence, the caption and any future proposed orders should be modified as set forth in the Order of Reassignment. (Dkt. No. 14.)

1 first request for an extension of time was granted by this court on April 22, 2010, and provided
2 plaintiff until May 10, 2010, to respond. (Dkt No. 19.)

3 However, in light of the parties stipulated request, the request for an extension of time
4 to June 9, 2010, is hereby GRANTED. No further extensions of time will be permitted absent
5 leave of court, and good cause shown. See Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 6(b) (providing that the court may
6 grant an extension of time “for good cause”).

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: May 13, 2010

9
10
11 
12 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26