

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 JANE DOE,

No. C 07-05596 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME**

10 v.

11 CITY OF SAN MATEO, et al.

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 On January 11, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to oppose defendants' motions
15 for summary judgment. Plaintiff's opposition is currently due on Friday, January 14, 2011. Plaintiff
16 has requested a sixty-day extension of time. She requests the extension of time because she is pro se,
17 because she was on vacation for over two of the weeks since defendants filed their motion, and because
18 she was ill for one week since then.

19 Defendants oppose plaintiff's request. They argue that plaintiff has already caused significant
20 delay in this case and has not prosecuted it diligently, that she was on notice as of November 10, 2010
21 that her opposition brief(s) would be due this Friday, and that she fails to explain why she was unable
22 to work while on vacation. Additionally, defendants argue that they will be prejudiced by any extension
23 of time that would cause the current hearing date of February 4, 2011, to be continued, as trial is
24 currently set for February 28, 2011. Defendants argue that moving the trial would cause them financial
25 hardship.

26 The Court hereby GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART plaintiff's motion. (Doc. 399.)
27 Plaintiff's opposition brief(s) are due **at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 21, 2011.** Defendants' reply
28 briefs are due **at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2011.** The hearing on defendants' motion for

1 summary judgement remains scheduled as before, for 9:00 a.m. on February 4, 2011. The pretrial
2 conference remains scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on February 22, 2011; trial remains scheduled for 8:30 a.m.
3 on February 28, 2011.

4
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: January 13, 2011



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge