

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
28IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE GEORGE HASH,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES LEE, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C-08-3729 MMC (PR)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO FILE OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION; DECLINING TO RECONSIDER
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION**

By order filed October 30, 2012, the Court granted defendants' administrative motion to extend the deadline to file dispositive motions, extended the deadline to February 15, 2013, and set a revised briefing schedule relative thereto. In so ruling, the Court noted plaintiff had not filed opposition to the administrative motion.

Before the Court is plaintiff's "Request for Time Enough to File His Opposition to Defendants' Administrative Motion," dated November 28, 2012 and filed by the Clerk of the Court on December 10, 2012, as well as an opposition to the administrative motion, also dated November 28, 2012 and filed December 10, 2012. In his request, plaintiff argues that, due to delays with the delivery of his mail, he did not receive the administrative motion until October 30, 2012, and that, due to various issues pertaining to his obtaining access to the prison law library, he was unable to prepare opposition to the administrative motion until November 28, 2012. Good cause appearing, plaintiff's request for an extension to file

1 his opposition is hereby GRANTED, and the Court will consider the opposition.

2 Having read and considered plaintiff's opposition, however, the Court finds no basis
3 to reconsider its order of October 30, 2012. Accordingly, the deadlines set forth in the
4 order of October 30, 2012 remain in effect.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: December 14, 2012


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28