1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KENNEISHA MOORE,	No. 2:14-cv-0820-KJN
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	
15	SECURITY,	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	The court's May 7, 2014 scheduling order in this case provides that plaintiff "shall file a	
19	motion for summary judgment and/or remand within 45 days from being served with a copy of	
20	the administrative record." (ECF No. 5.) On February 5, 2015, the Commissioner lodged the	
21	administrative transcript. (ECF No. 19.) Thereafter, on March 20, 2015, plaintiff timely filed her	
22	opening motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 22.)	
23	However, plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was also accompanied by a motion for	
24	clarification. (ECF No. 21.) That motion seeks unspecified clarification of the court's prior order	
25	denying plaintiff's December 31, 2014 "request for judgment" as premature. The court's prior	
26	order reasoned as follows:	
27	Pursuant to the court's scheduling order (ECF No. 5), plaintiff's	
28	"request for judgment," liberally construed as a motion for summary judgment, is premature, because the Commissioner has	
		1

not yet filed and served the administrative record. Therefore, the court denies the motion without prejudice as premature and will not consider the contents of that motion. After the Commissioner files the administrative record, plaintiff may file a motion for summary judgment in accordance with the requirements and deadlines set forth in the court's scheduling order.

(ECF No. 17.) It is unclear what further clarification plaintiff seeks. The administrative transcript has now been filed, and plaintiff has filed her opening motion for summary judgment. In accordance with the court's scheduling order, the Commissioner shall then file any opposition to plaintiff's motion within 30 days from service of plaintiff's motion, and plaintiff may, but need not, file a reply brief within 21 days from service with the Commissioner's opposition. (See ECF No. 5.) After expiration of the deadline for filing any reply brief, the case shall be submitted for decision without oral argument on the record and written briefing, unless the court specifically requests additional written briefing or oral argument. Because the court's orders are sufficiently clear and specific, no further clarification is needed at this juncture.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for clarification (ECF No. 21) is denied.
- 2. Further briefing in the case shall proceed in accordance with the court's May 7, 2014 scheduling order, as summarized above.

Dated: March 25, 2015

KENDALL J. NEWMAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE