

1 mailed on November 5, 2017 (ECF No. 43 at 4), making it timely under the prison mailbox rule,
2 Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988). However, the motion was not received by the court
3 until November 20, 2017. Given the length of time between the asserted mailing date and the
4 date the motion was received by the court, respondent will be given an opportunity to respond to
5 the motion for extension, including whether the motion was timely. See Fed. R. App. P.
6 4(a)(5)(B).

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within fourteen days of the filing of this
8 order, respondent may file a response to petitioner's motion for an extension of time.

9 DATED: November 22, 2017

10 
11 ALLISON CLAIRE
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28