8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
SCOTT JOHNSON,	No. 2:14-cv-2052 KJM DB PS
Plaintiff,	
v.	
MIKE PATEL,	<u>ORDER</u>
Defendant.	
Defendant is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was, therefore, referred to the	
undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On November	
6, 2019, the undersigned issued a scheduling order in this action. (ECF No. 84.) On July 17,	
20 2020, plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 84.) On July 22, 2020, plaintiff	
was advised that the filing was defective, having been improperly noticed for hearing before the	
22 assigned District Judge. (ECF No. 86.)	
On July 29, 2020, plaintiff re-noticed the motion for summary judgment before the	
undersigned. (ECF No. 89.) Plaintiff's filing, however, was again defective as it was noticed for	
25 hearing on less than 28 days in violation of Local Rule 230. (ECF No. 90.) On July 30, 2020,	
plaintiff filed a second amended notice of motion, noticing the motion for hearing before the	
27 undersigned on September 4, 2020. (ECF No. 91.)	
////	
	FOR THE EASTERN I  SCOTT JOHNSON,  Plaintiff,  v.  MIKE PATEL,  Defendant.  Defendant is proceeding in this action undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 30 6, 2019, the undersigned issued a scheduling of 2020, plaintiff filed a motion for summary jud was advised that the filing was defective, havi assigned District Judge. (ECF No. 86.)  On July 29, 2020, plaintiff re-noticed to undersigned. (ECF No. 89.) Plaintiff's filing, hearing on less than 28 days in violation of Local plaintiff filed a second amended notice of motoundersigned on September 4, 2020. (ECF No. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10

However, the scheduling order issued on November 6, 2019, explained that "[a]ll law and motion" must "be completed by August 14, 2020." (ECF No. 38 at 2.) The order also explained that "completed' in this context means that all law and motion matters must be heard" by August 14, 2020. (Id.) That order has not been amended. In this regard, the time for law and motion has closed. Plaintiff has not sought, let alone obtained, an amendment to the scheduling order. And the undersigned cannot simply disregard the deadlines set forth in the scheduling order.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's July 29, 2020 motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 89) is denied without prejudice to renewal; and
  - 2. The September 4, 2020 hearing of plaintiff's motion is vacated.

Dated: August 29, 2020

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DLB:6

DB/orders/orders.pro se/johnson2052.msj.den.ord