

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 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROSHAN ALAM,

No. C 07-02778 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER DENYING
STIPULATED REQUEST
FOR EXTENSION**


MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of
Social Security,

Defendant.

On June 23, 2011 — the due date for defendant’s opposition to plaintiff’s pending fees motion — the parties filed a stipulated request for a thirty-day extension of the briefing deadline. The parties state that “[t]he extension is needed because counsel are currently engaged in ongoing settlement discussions” (Dkt. No. 42). Good cause not having been shown, the request is **DENIED** except that defendant may have one extra day to file his opposition. Litigation must proceed in a timely fashion despite parallel efforts to settle the case. Defendant’s opposition is now due on **JUNE 24, 2011**. Plaintiff’s reply is now due on **JULY 1, 2011**. No more extensions will be granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 23, 2011.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE