

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

DEXTER BROWN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
PURUSHOTTAMA SAGIREDDY, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-0338 JAM AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration of the order denying his request for an extension of time to complete discovery. ECF No. 94. Since the previous motion was dismissed without prejudice (ECF No. 90), the court will construe the motion as a renewed motion for an extension of time.

Discovery is set to close on August 18, 2017, and discovery requests were to be served no later than June 19, 2017. ECF No. 87-1 at 5. Plaintiff’s previous request to modify the scheduling order requested that the court “extend the timeline for completion of discovery to no sooner than October 2017.” ECF No. 88 at 2. In denying plaintiff’s previous request for extension, the court advised plaintiff of the information he would need to provide in any future motions for extension. Specifically, he was directed to “identify what specific tasks he needs additional time to complete, request a specific amount of time for the extension, and explain both what he has been doing during the time he already had and why he needs the additional time

1 requested.” ECF No. 90. In his current motion, plaintiff identifies the discovery he seeks to  
2 pursue and states that he requires additional time because he expects to be impeded in his efforts,  
3 he “cannot reasonably be expected to move with the speed of trained legal professionals,” and he  
4 is being subject to various civil rights violations that must be documented. ECF No. 94 at 4-5.  
5 Plaintiff does not identify a specific amount of time for the extension or explain what he has been  
6 doing since the discovery and scheduling order was issued on April 27, 2017. However, the court  
7 will assume that he is still seeking an extension until sometime in October and that he has been  
8 spending his time documenting the other alleged civil rights violations.

9 Discovery has been open for nearly three months, and there is no indication in plaintiff’s  
10 current motion that he has taken any steps during that time toward obtaining the discovery he  
11 seeks. ECF No. 94. Instead, he states that he anticipates obstruction of his efforts to obtain  
12 discovery, which implies that he has yet to begin putting forth any efforts to obtain discovery, and  
13 all evidence indicates that he has spent his time documenting the various alleged civil rights  
14 violations instead of pursuing this case. ECF Nos. 88, 94. In denying the previous motion,  
15 plaintiff was clearly advised that the court will not extend litigation deadlines simply because he  
16 chooses to prioritize other matters (ECF No. 90) and he has failed to demonstrate that he has  
17 made any efforts at pursuing discovery since being so advised. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate  
18 good cause for modifying the scheduling order and extending discovery and his motion will  
19 therefore be denied.

20 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is  
21 construed as a renewed motion for extension of time (ECF No. 94) and is denied without  
22 prejudice.

23 DATED: July 18, 2017

24   
25 ALLISON CLAIRE  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
27  
28