

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

GREGORY SMITH,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-0762 KJN (TEMP) P

vs.

PEETRANJAN SAHOTA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On October 1, 2010, defendants filed a motion for an extension of time in which to respond to the complaint and on November 18, 2010, filed a motion to dismiss. They filed another motion to dismiss on December 15, 2010; and on December 23, 2010, defendants filed a motion for an extension of time, nunc pro tunc, to file the motion and serve it on plaintiff's new address.

In the meantime, plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time in which to oppose the first motion to dismiss, but then timely filed his opposition. In addition, he has filed a motion for a clarification.

1. Defendants' motions for extensions of time (doc. nos. 24 & 35) are granted; and the motions to dismiss (doc no. 30) are deemed timely.

////

