Hayes v. Hea	Ith Enrollment Group Inc.	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
	UNITED STATES D	DISTRICT COURT
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	SUSAN HAYES, individually and on	Case No. 2:17-cv-00613-KJM-KJN
11	behalf of all others similarly situated,	
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER
13	1 familitis,	
14	v.	
15	THE HEALTH ENROLLMENT	
16	GROUP, INC.; MARC MUNOZ; KEVIN ROMERO; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive and each of them,	
17	through 10, inclusive and each of them,	
18		
19	Defendants.	
20	As provided by the Stipulation ¹ and good cause appearing,	
21	IT IS SO ORDERED, that defendants' response date to file a response to	
22	plaintiff's lawsuit has been extended through October 13, 2017.	
23	DATED: September 22, 2017.	2017
24		11 A M. 10/
25		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26		
27	¹ The court observes that Plaintiff failed to obtain	n a signature for Defendants' Counsel as
28	required by Local Rule 143(a)(1). Local Rule 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i) is a rule for the Central District of California. But the court still grants this extension in light of the exceptional circumstances	
20	created by Hurricane Irma and the hurricane's ef	

Doc. 13