

1 BESS M. BREWER, #100364
 LAW OFFICE OF
 2 BESS M. BREWER & ASSOCIATES
 P.O. Box 5088
 3 Sacramento, CA 95817
 Telephone: (916) 509-7051
 4

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 6
 7
 8

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 10 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **SANDRA FELTIS**

Case No. 11-CIV-0723 KJN

12)
 13)
 14)
 15)
 16)
 17)
 18)
 19)
 20)
 21)
 22)
 23)
 24)
 25)
 26)
 27)
 28)

**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
 ORDER EXTENDING PLAINTIFF'S
 TIME TO FILE SUMMARY
 JUDGEMENT MOTION**

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE
Commissioner of Social Security
of the United States of America,

Defendant.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties, through their attorneys, that the Plaintiff's time to file his summary judgment is hereby extended from August 29, 2011, to October 11, 2011. This is Plaintiff's first extension and is required due to Plaintiff's counsel's impacted briefing schedule and need to prioritize older cases.

////

////

////

1 Dated: August 29, 2011

/s/Bess M. Brewer
BESS M. BREWER
Attorney at Law

3 Attorney for Plaintiff

5 Dated: August 29, 2011

Benjamin B. Wagner

United States Attorney

/s/ Elizabeth Barry
ELIZABETH BARRY

Special Assistant United States Attorney
Attorneys for Defendant

11 **ORDER**

12 The stipulation of the parties is HEREBY APPROVED.¹ Plaintiff shall have until
13 October 11, 2011, to file a motion for summary judgment. The court's scheduling order is modified
14 accordingly.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: September 1, 2011

18 
19 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
20 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21
22 ¹ The undersigned notes that plaintiff, who is represented by an attorney who appears regularly
23 before the undersigned and all too regularly seeks extensions of time based on her "impacted briefing
24 schedule," filed this stipulation and proposed order on the day that plaintiff was required to file a motion
25 for summary judgment. Plaintiff's counsel is again admonished that, pursuant to Local Rule 144(d),
26 "[c]ounsel shall seek to obtain a necessary extension from the Court or from other counsel or parties in
27 an action as soon as the need for an extension becomes apparent," and that requests for court-approved
28 extensions brought on or after the required filing date "are looked upon with disfavor." The undersigned
also notes that plaintiff's counsel appears to be falling behind in her cases again—plaintiff's counsel
filed four requests for extensions in four separate cases between August 26, 2011, and August 29, 2011.
(See Pacheco v. Astrue, No. 2:10-cv-1733 KJN (E.D. Cal.); Carson v. Astrue, No. 2:11-cv-0632 KJN
(E.D. Cal.); Feltis v. Astrue, No. 2:11-cv-0723 KJN (E.D. Cal.); Juarez v. Astrue, No. 2:10-cv-0748 KJN
(E.D. Cal.).)