UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RENE ORTIZ, Plaintiff, v. DIVERSIFIED CONSULTANTS, INC., et al. Defendants.	No. 2:17-cv-0713-TLN-KJN PS <u>ORDER</u>

On August 21, 2017, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss, and provided plaintiff 21 days to file a second amended complaint. (ECF No. 26.) Thereafter, on September 8, 2017, the court, upon plaintiff's request, granted plaintiff additional time until October 6, 2017, to file a second amended complaint. (ECF No. 28.)

Presently pending before the court is plaintiff's motion for an additional extension of at least 21 days to file a second amended complaint, along with a request for the court to answer certain specified questions. (ECF No. 31.) Because the court cannot provide plaintiff with legal advice or litigation guidance, plaintiff's request for the court to answer the specified questions is denied. The court's order granting defendants' motion to dismiss outlined the reasons for dismissal of the first amended complaint, and specifically identified the deficiencies of plaintiff's claims.

However, the court grants plaintiff's request for a 21-day extension to file a second amended complaint in accordance with the court's August 21, 2017 order. Plaintiff is cautioned that no further extensions will be granted.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's request for the court to answer certain specified questions is DENIED.
2. Plaintiff shall file any second amended complaint no later than October 27, 2017.
3. Defendants shall respond to any second amended complaint within 21 days of its filing.
4. No further extensions will be granted. Failure to timely file a second amended complaint may result in dismissal of the action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

This order resolves ECF No. 31.

Dated: October 4, 2017

KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE