(PC) Castro v. Covello Doc. 20

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:23-cv-0694 DC AC P JOSEPH ANTHONY CASTRO, 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 COVELLO, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On October 11, 2024, the court reassigned this case to a different district judge. ECF No. 18 15. This reassignment did not affect the magistrate judge assigned to this case. 19 That same day, the court received plaintiff's request for extension of time to file a First 20 Amended Complaint. ECF No. 17. A few days later, the magistrate judge granted plaintiff's 21 request for a 30-day extension to file a First Amended Complaint. ECF No. 18. Apparently 22 unaware that the court had already granted plaintiff's initial request, plaintiff mailed what the 23 court construes to be a duplicative motion for extension of time on October 17, 2024. ECF No. 19 ("I just received this notice that one of my pending cases has been reassigned. Due to this 24 25 change I feel it best to resend a request for a 30 day extension."). Because this motion is 26 substantively duplicative of the recently granted request for 30-day extension, the court denies the

motion (ECF No. 19) as unnecessary, duplicative, and moot.

27

28

////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 19) is denied; and
- 2. Plaintiff has thirty days after being served with the court order granting his initial request for an extension (ECF No. 18) to file a First Amended Complaint.

DATED: October 23, 2024

ALLISON CLAIRE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE