

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SACRAMENTO DIVISION

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

NAM BA NGUYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA PRISON HEALTH  
SERVICE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-963-EFB

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO EXTEND  
ALL DEADLINES BY 90 DAYS  
PENDING PLAINTIFF'S RELOCATION  
AND RESOLUTION OF IMMIGRATION  
STATUS**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)

Action Filed: 5/15/2013

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

This § 1983 action was filed by former prison inmate Plaintiff Nam Ba Nguyen against Defendants Dr. Osman, Nurse Sherman Champen, R.L Andreason, Nathaniel Elam and California Prison Health Service on May 15, 2013. Plaintiff advises that he was paroled on September 8, 2016, but that he was taken into custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and is currently trying to resolve his immigration status. Plaintiff has requested a 90 day stay of all currently pending deadlines, including the deadline to oppose Defendant Elam's Motion to Dismiss (ECF 51). Defendants do not oppose the request, but ask that all deadlines be extended for 90 days.

//

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the following will be the new schedule of deadlines in this  
2 matter:

|                                                                              |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 3 Defendants' deadline to complete discovery                                 | 12/16/2016 |
| 4 Plaintiff's deadline to complete discovery                                 | 1/21/2017  |
| 5 Plaintiff's deadline to amend the complaint                                | 12/16/2016 |
| 6 Dispositive motions deadline                                               | 3/2/2017   |
| 7 Plaintiff's deadline to oppose Defendant Elam's Motion to Dismiss (ECF 51) | 12/27/2016 |

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall have until December 27, 2016 to file any  
9 opposition to Defendant Elam's Motion to Dismiss (ECF 51), and that Rule 230 (I) will continue  
10 to apply with respect to the motion.

11  
12  
13 DATED: September 15, 2016



Hon. Edmund F. Brennan  
U.S. Magistrate Judge