

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

LEON HARDIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

D. BAUGHMAN, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1340 MCE AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion for an extension of time to file objections to the May 27, 2021 Findings and Recommendations. ECF No. 46.

Plaintiff filed objections on June 21, 2021.¹ ECF No. 42. Although plaintiff asserts that the objections that he previously sent to the court were incomplete because he was afraid of missing the deadline, he fails to explain why he waited three weeks after sending the partial objections to advise the court that his objections were not complete or to seek additional time. In that time, defendants have responded to the objections, ECF No. 43, and the district judge, after conducting a *de novo* review of the case, has adopted the findings and recommendations, ECF No. 45.

¹ Since plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se, he is afforded the benefit of the prison mailbox rule. *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988) (establishing rule that a prisoner’s court document is deemed filed on the date the prisoner delivered the document to prison officials for mailing).

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an extension of time,
2 ECF No. 46, is DENIED.

3 DATED: July 21, 2021

4 
5 _____
6 ALLISON CLAIRE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28