

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ROBERT WILLAIM TUNSTALL, JR.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JOSEPH BICK, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:16-CV-2604-KJM-DMC-P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion, ECF No. 109, for an extension of time. Plaintiff’s motion is denied because, as of the date Plaintiff filed his motion, no deadlines were pending. Given the circumstances outlined in Plaintiff’s motion, specifically COVID-19 prison restrictions, the Court will sua sponte grant Plaintiff additional time to file an opposition to Defendants’ motion to revoke Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status, which was filed after Plaintiff filed his motion for an extension of time.

Also before the Court is Defendants’ motion, as part of their motion to revoke Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status at ECF No. 116, that the deadline to file a responsive pleading be extended to 30 days following the Court’s final ruling on the motion to revoke in forma pauperis status. Good cause appearing therefor, Defendants’ motion is granted.

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time, ECF No. 109, is denied;
2. Plaintiff's opposition to Defendants' motion to revoke Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status, ECF No. 116, is due within 60 days of the date of this order; and
3. Defendants' responsive pleading or motion shall be filed, if necessary, within 30 days of the date of the Court's final ruling on Defendants' motion to revoke Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status.

Dated: January 25, 2022



\_\_\_\_\_  
DENNIS M. COTA  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE