IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER GRABEK,

Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-2892 WBS GGH P

vs.

KATHLEEN DICKINSON, Warden, et al.,

Defendants. ORDER

_____/

By order, filed on July 26, 2011, plaintiff's request for a 90-day extension of time was denied because plaintiff simply made an inadequate indication as to why any such time extension was needed. Subsequently, plaintiff has filed another request for a time extension request, along with a request for a clarification of the order of July 26, 2011, once again without expressly identifying why he needs such an extension at this time. The court cannot be any clearer than to say that seeking a time extension without identifying why one is needed is simply insufficient, even when plaintiff is in administrative segregation. There is no motion filed by defendants requiring a response from plaintiff at this time. While the discovery deadline of September 23, 2011 (also noted in the prior order) is approaching, plaintiff makes no reference to any intention to bring a motion to compel discovery, but simply announces an unspecified need for a time extension on the basis that he will be in ad seg until late October, 2011.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for clarification, filed on September 1, 2011 (docket # 27), is granted to the extent provided herein, but his motion for an extension of time (docket # 27) is again denied for lack of good cause.

DATED: September 8, 2011

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

GGH:009
grab2892.ord