

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARNOLD AGUIRRE,
Plaintiff,
v.
DR. J. ADAMO; et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 09-763 MHP (pr)

**ORDER STAYING DISCOVERY AND
EXTENDING DEADLINES**

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

Defendants have moved to stay discovery pending a ruling on their motion for summary judgment in which they have raised a qualified immunity defense. The U.S. Supreme Court has made it abundantly clear that a district court should stay discovery until the threshold question of qualified immunity is settled. See Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998); Anderson v. Creighton, 483 U.S. 635, 646 n.6 (1987); Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). The motion is GRANTED. (Docket # 53.) Discovery is now STAYED until the court rules on the pending motion for summary judgment.

In light of the stay on discovery, plaintiff’s motions to compel discovery responses are DISMISSED without prejudice to plaintiff refileing them if defendants’ motion for summary judgment and to dismiss is denied. (Docket # 48, # 50, # 54, # 58.)

The court now sua sponte extends the deadlines on defendants’ motion for summary judgment and to dismiss:

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

a. Plaintiff's opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and to dismiss must be filed with the court and served upon defense counsel no later than **February 4, 2011**. No further extensions of this deadline will be granted.

b. If defendants wish to file a reply brief, they must file and serve the reply brief no later than **February 18, 2011**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 7, 2011


Marilyn Hall Patel
United States District Judge