

- 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

KENNETH HILL,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-1896 MCE EFB P

vs.

J. HALL, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The February 29, 2012 discovery and scheduling order set April 23, 2012, as the date by which all written requests for discovery were to be served. Dckt. No. 24. On April 26, 2012, plaintiff moved to extend that deadline by 30 days because of a lockdown, lack of access to his legal property and the law library, and a change of address. Dckt. No. 27. Defendants did not respond to plaintiff's request.

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

1 A scheduling order may be modified upon a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
2 16(b). Good cause exists when the moving party demonstrates he cannot meet the deadline  
3 despite exercising due diligence. *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th  
4 Cir. 1992). Good cause appearing, plaintiff's request to modify the scheduling order, Dckt. No.  
5 27, is granted, and plaintiff's requests for written discovery must be served no later than May 23,  
6 2012.

7 So ordered.

8 DATED: May 21, 2012.

  
9 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26