

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAGHVENDRA SINGH,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Defendant.

No. 2:13-cv-780-TLN-EFB PS

ORDER

On August 12, 2014, plaintiff filed a motion to stay, motion for terminating sanctions, and a motion for appointment of counsel.<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 37. Plaintiff noticed his motions for hearing the following day in violation of this court’s local rules. *Id.*; see E.D. Cal. L.R. 230. On August 13, 2014, the court issued a minute order, directing plaintiff to re-notice his motions for hearing in compliance with the court’s local rules. ECF No. 38.

On August 14, 2014, plaintiff filed an ex parte motion for an order shortening time. ECF No. 39. In this motion, plaintiff set his August 12, 2014 motions for hearing on September 17, 2014, but requested that the court hear the matter as soon as possible. *Id.* at 1. The motion to shorten time addressed the merits of plaintiff’s claims and failed to provide any justification for why the matter should be heard on an earlier date. See E.D. Cal. L.R. 144(e) (“Ex parte

---

<sup>1</sup> This case, in which plaintiff is proceeding pro se, is before the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(21). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1 applications to shorten time will not be granted except upon affidavit of counsel showing a  
2 satisfactory explanation for the need for the issuance of such an order and for the failure of  
3 counsel to obtain a stipulation for the issuance of such an order from other counsel or parties in  
4 the action.”). Accordingly, the motion was denied.

5 On August 27, plaintiff filed another motion for an order shortening time. ECF No. 43.  
6 This request again fails to comply with the court’s local rules. Plaintiff does not explain why he  
7 did not obtain a stipulation for an order to shorten time, nor does he provide an affidavit showing  
8 a satisfactory explanation for the need to shorten time. Accordingly, plaintiff’s August 27, 2014  
9 ex parte motion is denied, and his motion to stay, motion for terminating sanctions, and motion  
10 for appointment of counsel will be heard on September 17, 2014.

11 DATED: September 4, 2014.

12   
13 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28