

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE B. ORTIZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. REYNOLDS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:10-cv-1380-MCE-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is defendant Miranda’s June 24, 2013 motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 73. On July 18, 2013, after plaintiff failed to timely respond to the motion, the court issued an order, requiring that plaintiff respond within 21 days. ECF No. 75. On August 5, 2013, plaintiff filed a document requesting that the court either grant him 60 days to file an opposition or, alternatively, treat his filing as an opposition to defendant’s motion. ECF No. 77. Plaintiff offers no justification for another 60 days to prepare his opposition, aside from the fact that he is a “layman to the law.” *Id.* He has already had well over a month to prepare his opposition and fails to demonstrate that good cause exists for a further extension of time.

/////
/////
/////

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's August 5, 2013 filing (ECF No. 77) shall serve as plaintiff's opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment.

Dated: August 14, 2013.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE