

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABOLGHASSEM ALIZADEH, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-00577-TLN-KJN

ORDER

Plaintiff United States of America (“Plaintiff”) filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on February 2, 2017. (ECF No. 29.) On April 27, 2017, the Court granted Defendant Azita Alizadeh an extension of time to respond to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 29). On May 1, 2017, the Court clarified that the extension applied solely to Defendant Azita Alizadeh and reminded the remaining Defendants that their oppositions were due on May 4, 2017. (ECF No. 46.) The Court moved the hearing on the motion for summary judgment for all Defendants to July 13, 2017, for the purpose of promoting judicial economy. On May 5, 2017, a day after their oppositions were due, the remaining Defendants filed an ex parte application for a 56-day extension of time to the same date as Defendant Azita Alizadeh. (ECF No. 47.) Defendants did not provide any explanation as to why their application could not have been filed in the three days between the Court’s reminder and the opposition deadline or why the application was filed a day after the deadline. The Court will not grant an extension when the application is

1 not timely. Furthermore, the remaining Defendants filed their oppositions for which they sought
2 an extension on May 5, 2017. Accordingly, Defendants ex parte application for extension of time
3 is hereby DENIED as moot.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: May 18, 2017



6
7
8 Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28