

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 RANDOLPH M. DIAZ,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-1388 MCE KJN P

12 vs.

13 M. MARTEL, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/

16 By notice filed July 19, 2012 (Dkt. No. 25), and pursuant to Woods v. Carey,
17 __F.3d __, 2012 WL 2626912 (9th Cir., July 06, 2012), defendants have again informed plaintiff
18 of the requirements for opposing defendants' pending motion to dismiss, filed on April 2, 2012.
19 (See Dkt. No. 25 at 2; see also Dkt. No. 22 at 1-2.) Defendants also request, on behalf of
20 plaintiff, an extension of time within which plaintiff must file and serve his opposition to the
21 pending motion.

22 For good cause shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

23 1. Defendant's request (Dkt. No. 25), to accord plaintiff an extension of time
24 within which to file and serve an opposition to defendants' pending motion to dismiss, is
25 granted;

26 ///


1 2. Plaintiff shall file and serve an opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss
2 within twenty-eight (28) days after the filing date of this order;

3 3. Defendants may file and serve a reply to plaintiff's opposition within fourteen
4 (14) days after service of plaintiff's opposition; and

5 4. This court's order filed June 20, 2012 (Dkt. No. 24), requiring that plaintiff file
6 his opposition within thirty days, is vacated.

7 SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: July 24, 2012

9
10 
11 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 diaz1388.Woods.eot
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26