

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

RICHARD JOSEPH CRANE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
RODRIGUEZ, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0208 TLN KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file and serve an opposition to defendants’ December 5, 2016 motion for summary judgment and a reply to defendants’ oppositions to plaintiff’s November 23, 2016 motion for sanctions. Good cause appearing, plaintiff’s motion is granted. However, no further extensions of time will be granted.

Plaintiff has again filed a motion to strike defendants’ oppositions to his motion for sanctions, claiming they were untimely filed. However, as explained in the December 14, 2016 order, defendants’ oppositions were timely-filed. Plaintiff’s motion to strike is denied.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


1. Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 90) is granted.
2. Plaintiff is granted forty-five days from the date of this order in which to file and serve his opposition to defendants’ motion for summary judgment. Defendants’ reply, if any, shall be filed within fourteen days thereafter.

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

3. Plaintiff is also granted forty-five days from the date of this order to file his reply to defendants' oppositions to plaintiff's November 23, 2016 motion for sanctions.

4. Plaintiff's motion to strike (ECF No. 91) is denied.

Dated: December 27, 2016

  
KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/mp/cw; cran0208.36(2)