

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

BOON RAWD TRADING  
INTERNATIONAL CO., LTD,

No. C 09-05617 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

PALEEWONG TRADING CO. INC.,

**SECOND ORDER  
DENYING REQUEST  
FOR EXTENSION  
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS  
\_\_\_\_\_


On December 17, 2010, the fact discovery period was extended to January 21, 2011 for the limited purpose of conducting two depositions. On December 21, 2010, Paleewong Trading Co., Inc. filed a letter requesting (1) that the deadline to file dispositive motions be extended from January 5, 2011 to February 11, 2011 and (2) that no dispositive motion be scheduled for hearing prior to February 24, 2011. The letter did not represent that Paleewong conferred with Boon Rawd Trading International Co., Ltd. to ascertain its position on these requests. Because this letter failed to comport with the requirements of Civil Local Rule 6-2 or 6-3 (as such requests must do pursuant to Rule 6-1(b)), Paleewong's requests were immediately denied without prejudice to Paleewong refileing its requests in conformity with the applicable rules.

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

Later the same day, Paleewong filed a second letter that “follows from” the order denying the requests set forth in the first letter. This second letter represents that counsel for Paleewong conferred with counsel for Boon Rawd and that Boon Rawd’s counsel “stated that they do not have any problem conceptually with Paleewong’s request for extension of time” but “would not stipulate to our request” (Dkt. No. 125). Paleewong’s requests for deadline extensions, as repeated in its second letter on December 21, again are procedurally inadequate and therefore again are **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Paleewong may make one more attempt at properly submitting its requests. Paleewong’s counsel are advised that if Boon Rawd’s counsel will not stipulate to the requests, they must be submitted as a motion to change time. Counsel are again urged to read and follow the applicable Civil Local Rules.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 22, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE