1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JAMES GRINOLS, et al., No. 12-cv-02997-MCE-DAD 12 Plaintiffs, ORDER 13 ٧. 14 ELECTORAL COLLEGE et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On December 27, 2012, Defendants filed an Ex Parte Motion to Extend the Time 18 for Responding to Plaintiffs' Subpoenas. (ECF No. 27) Prior to the January 3, 2013 19 hearing, Plaintiffs filed several subpoenas. (ECF Nos. 15-24) Plaintiffs filed their 20 subpoenas on Christmas Eve, Christmas Day and the day after Christmas. Id. In all but 21 22 one subpoena, Plaintiffs requested documents within a week. Id. A-one week response time would be unreasonable at any time during the year, but such a quick turnaround is 23 especially unreasonable during the final weeks of the calendar year. Fed. R. Civ. P. 45. 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 1

1	Accordingly, Defendants' motion is GRANTED and Plaintiffs are ordered to modify
2	their subpoenas in compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 45, allowing Defendants a
3	reasonable amount of time to comply.
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	II IS SO ORDERED.
6	Dated: January 17, 2013
7	Moun le 1.
8	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR) CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	SINITED STATES BISTAIST SOCIAL
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	