

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

KARIM ABDELLA and PATRICIA
ABDELLA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FOLSOM CORDOVA UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Defendant.

No. 2:14-cv-1259 KJM DAD PS

ORDER

Plaintiffs Karim Abdella and Patricia Abdella are proceeding pro se in the above entitled action. The action has therefore been referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21) for all purposes encompassed by that rule.

On December 19, 2014, defendant filed a letter requesting a further extension of the December 19, 2014 deadline for the lodging of the administrative record in this action. (Dkt. No. 18.) Therein, defendant explains that the “parties are still in the process of working through issues,” some of which “are complex,” and that the defendant is attempting to locate some evidence that may be missing from the administrative record. (Id. at 1.) Defendant explains that their request was submitted by letter instead of by way of a stipulation and proposed order

/////
/////


1 because the defendant was “unable to get a stipulation executed prior to the lodging deadline.”¹
2 (Id.) Defendant requests the deadline be extended to January 30, 2015.

3 Good cause appearing, the request for a further extension of time will be granted. No
4 further extensions of time for this purpose will be granted absent a substantial showing of good
5 cause. Moreover, as a result of the further extension of time, the schedule set forth in the court’s
6 October 15, 2014 order will likely have to be amended.

7 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 8 1. Defendant’s December 19, 2014 request for an extension of time (Dkt. No. 18) is
9 granted;
- 10 2. A copy of the administrative record shall be lodged with the court, and served upon the
11 plaintiffs, on or before January 30, 2015;
- 12 3. On or before February 6, 2015, each party may, but is not required to, file a proposed
13 amended schedule with respect to further proceedings in this action.

14 Dated: January 8, 2015

15 

16 _____
17 DALE A. DROZD
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 DAD:6
19 Ddad1\orders.pro se\abdella1259.eot.ord.docx

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 _____
27 ¹ Defendant’s letter reflects that the pro se plaintiffs were informed of the contents of the letter
28 and that a copy of the letter was served on the plaintiffs. Neither plaintiff has filed an objection to
the defendant’s letter request for an extension of time. The court has construed the lack of
objection to be a reflection of plaintiffs’ non-opposition to the request.