

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

## 5 || Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

11 | **SANDRA FELTIS** ) Case No. 11-CIV-0723 KJN

14 Plaintiff, ) ORDER EXTENDING PLAINTIFF'S  
15 ) TIME TO FILE SUMMARY  
 ) JUDGEMENT MOTION

**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.

26 | Page

27 | //

28 | // /

1 Dated: August 29, 2011

/s/*Bess M. Brewer*

BESS M. BREWER  
Attorney at Law

3 Attorney for Plaintiff

4

5 Dated: August 29, 2011

Benjamin B. Wagner

6 United States Attorney

7 \_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ *Elizabeth Barry*  
ELIZABETH BARRY

8  
9 Special Assistant United States Attorney  
Attorneys for Defendant

10

11 **ORDER**

12 The stipulation of the parties is HEREBY APPROVED.<sup>1</sup> 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.

16

17 DATED: September 1, 2011

18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 *Kendall J. Newman*  
20 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The undersigned notes that plaintiff, who is represented by an attorney who appears regularly before the undersigned and all too regularly seeks extensions of time based on her "impacted briefing schedule," filed this stipulation and proposed order on the day that plaintiff was required to file a motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff's counsel is again admonished that, pursuant to Local Rule 144(d), "[c]ounsel shall seek to obtain a necessary extension from the Court or from other counsel or parties in an action as soon as the need for an extension becomes apparent," and that requests for court-approved 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.)).