

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

H. DYMITRI HARASZEWSKI,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
KNIPP, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-2494 JAM DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. He has filed a document seeking “clarification” of this court’s October 28, 2020 order and an extension of time. First, plaintiff expresses some confusion over a reference to a motion to dismiss in section 2.a. of the order. There is no such reference. Section 2.a. directs plaintiff to file by November 10 any objections to this court’s August 12 recommendation that his motion to amend be denied. (See ECF No. 142 at 2.) What plaintiff appears to be attempting by this argument is an additional basis for another extension of time to file objections.

This court recommended denial of the motion to amend based on prejudice to defendants and plaintiff’s undue delay in bringing the motion. (ECF No. 142.) Those issues were raised in defendants’ April 17, 2020 opposition to the motion. (ECF No. 112.) With two extensions of time (ECF Nos. 119, 125), plaintiff had three months to research those issues and file his July 23, 2020 reply (ECF No. 126). Plaintiff has been provided two extensions of time (ECF Nos. 139,

1 142) and has had an additional three months to research those same issues and file objections.

2 This court appreciates the difficulties plaintiff has had in conducting legal research. But,  
3 while plaintiff alleges general difficulties with conducting legal research, he does not specifically  
4 explain what he needs to research and why that research is necessary to file objections.

5 In the October 28 order, this court advised plaintiff that no further extensions of time  
6 would be granted to file objections to the August 12 findings and recommendations. Plaintiff has  
7 not shown any extraordinary circumstances that might cause this court to re-think that order.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an extension of time  
9 (ECF No. 145) is denied.

10 DATED: November 18, 2020

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

/s/ DEBORAH BARNES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DLB:9  
DB/prisoner-civil rights/hara2494.mta obj eot(3)