1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CARSON RHODES THALER,	No. 2:14-cv-2013 MCE GGH PS
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER
14	AMADOR COUNTY, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff has filed a request for extension "for the Federal Complaint" already filed by	
18	him. He states that because he is disabled, he requests leniency by the court in regard to	
19	extensions of time in this case. (ECF No. 3 at 4.) The court is unable to discern why plaintiff	
20	needs an extension of time. Because a complaint is already on file, and there are no other	
21	pending matters for which an extension might be necessary at the present time, plaintiff's request	
22	will be denied as unnecessary.	
23	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: Plaintiff's August 29, 2014 motion for an	
24	extension of time (ECF No. 3) is denied as unnecessary.	
25	Dated: September 9, 2014	
26	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows	
27	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
28	GGH:076/Thaler2013.36	