1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	PETER T. HARRELL,	No. 2:14-cv-1595 KJM GGH
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	HORNBROOK COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, MICHELLE	
15	HANSON, PATRICIA BROWN, SHARREL BARNES, ROBERT	
16	WINSTON, JULIE BOWLES, CLINT DINGMAN, ERNEST GOFF, ROGER	
17	GIFFORD, ROBERT PUCKETT, SR., HORNBROOK COMMUNITY BIBLE	
18	CHURCH, STEVEN CRITTENDEN, MURPHY PEARSON BRADLEY AND	
19	FEENEY, BRADLEY & FEENEY, INC., BASIC LABORATORY, INC., DUKE	
20	MARTIN, KISHER, WINTON & BOSTON, and Does 1-20,	
21	Respondents.	
22		
23		
24	PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	
25	This case was filed by Plaintiff on July 7, 2014. ECF No. 1. Plaintiff was granted In	
26	Forma Pauperis status on August 6, 2014, ECF No. 3, and has been acting in this matter <i>pro se</i> .	
27	Since that date the following matters have been calendared for hearing by the court:	
28		1

defendants on 4/24/15. ECF No. 27.

27

1	36. 7/22/16 The court vacated the August 5 hearing, rescheduled it for August 22,	
2	2016, and directed that any further motions should be noticed and filed in accordance with the	
3	requirements of Local Rule 230. ECF No. 83.	
4	37. 7/25/16 Defendants Bradley & Feeney, Inc., Murphy Pearson, and Hornbrook	
5	Community Services District filed Replies regarding the pending Motion to Dismiss. ECF Nos.	
6	84-86.	
7	38. 7/27/16 Plaintiff requested a continuance of the 8/22 hearing date re his motions	
8	for Preliminary Injunction and Appointment of a Receiver. ECF No. 88, and Objections to the	
9	Court's 7/22/15 Order. ECF No. 89.	
10	39. 7/28/16 Defendants Kisher, Winton, Hornbrook Community Service District and	
11	Robert Winton filed Reply Memoranda re their Motions to Dismiss and Strike, ECF No.s 90, 81,	
12	and Hornbrook Community Services District Objected to Plaintiffs Request for a Continuance of	
13	the Hearing. ECF No. 92.	
14	After having cycled through two Motions to Dismiss and to Strike, granted several	
15	extensions of time to Answer or Respond to Plaintiff, Plaintiff, having missed the deadline to	
16	oppose the pending Motions, seeks yet another extension of time to file Opposition Item No.	
17	38, <u>supra</u> .	
18	<u>DISCUSSION</u>	
19	As pointed out in the Oppositions to Plaintiff's Requests, ECF Nos. 71, 77, 82 and 92, the	
20	court has been considerate of plaintiff's previous requests for extensions of time. Yet, there are	
21	two sides in this litigation and both must be given due consideration. Plaintiff filed this lawsuit	
22	which has, no doubt, caused much expense and time for all concerned, including the court.	
23	Defendants' concerns in this regard are well stated in their effort to prevent this case being stalled	
24	even further.	
25		
26		

27

28

¹ Plaintiff did, however, find the time to file his own Motion for Preliminary Injunction and to Appoint a Receiver after the last round of Motions to Dismiss and Strike were already on the court's calendar. Item No. 33, supra.

The court will not base its decision regarding how to proceed on the technical aspects of the rules when viewing an *ex parte* request to extend time, but it is important to recognize that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1 requires that all rules are to be applied in a manner which will aid in the "just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." Although not all of the delay in this case has been occasioned by plaintiff's requests, at this point the case progression has been anything but "speedy and inexpensive." Plaintiff must realize that when he invokes the power of the court to require persons and entities to appear in court, regardless of their wishes, he incurs a responsibility to aid in the application of Rule 1. He is not permitted to make the litigation a punishment in itself in the hopes that the other side will simply wear out or run out of resources.² Plaintiff must also realize that the issues in this case occasioned by his 160 page plus Second Amended Complaint, naming a multitude of defendants, are complex and numerous and the court requires time to sort out the legitimate issues, if any, from those which should be eliminated from the case.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

Therefore, plaintiff having filed no timely opposition to the pending motions originally scheduled for hearing on August 4, 2016, and now pending on the court's September 22, 2016 hearing calendar, the court declines to hold a live hearing. The pending Motions will be heard on the papers submitted. Although the court will endeavor to decide all Motions correctly, plaintiff shall have no further say in how the ruling is shaped, except by way of any objections he may file to Objections to the ultimate Findings and Recommendations of the court.

In addition, in order for the court to maintain control of the unruly docket in this case, and because further motions may well be irrelevant if the court were to find that all or some of the defendants should be dismissed, no further non-emergency motions will be entertained by the court until there is a final ruling on the present motions. In the event of a bona fide emergency which necessitates the filing of an emergency motion, the party or parties desiring to file that

² Whether this is plaintiff's intent or not is beside the point at this stage. Whether because of intent or merely through failure to adhere to rules that are clearly spelled out, the effect is the same – inordinate delay and cost.

motion shall first obtain the permission of the court to file such motion by making a request detailing the need for it which shall be responded to by the opposing side in five court days from receipt of the request either electronically or by paper service, whichever is later. The court will then act expeditiously to resolve the request to file the emergency motion. The parties are cautioned that abuse of this emergency motion procedure shall result in sanctions. For the foregoing reasons, it is ordered as followed: 1. The Clerk shall vacate the court's September 22, 2016 hearing on the Motions pending in this case; 2. No further filings will be accepted from any party unless in conformity to the emergency motion procedure outlined herein; All pending matters are under submission to await a formal ruling from the court. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: August 1, 2016 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE