1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	CHRISTOPHER YANKE,	No. C-08-04379 EDL
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER REGARDING TIME TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
10		
11	CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	
12	Defendants/	
13		
14	On March 20, 2009, the parties filed a stipulation and proposed order to continue the initial	
15	case management conference which stated, among other things, that the parties stipulated that	
16	Defendants would have twenty days to respond to Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint. The	
17	Court granted the request to continue the case management conference on March 23, 2009. In the	
18	Court's separate March 23, 2009 Order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss, the Court ordered	
19	that Defendants' response would be due ten days after the filing of the Second Amended Complaint.	
20	Defendants have asked the Court for clarification regarding the time for Defendants' response to	
21	Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, which was filed on April 6, 2009. In light of the parties'	
22	March 20, 2009 stipulation, the time to respond to the Second Amended Complaint shall be twenty	
23	days from April 6, 2009.	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 16, 2009	Elizah R. D. Laporte
25	T -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -,	ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE United States Magistrate Judge
26		<i>5</i>
27		
28		