

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 CALIFORNIASHARON BRIDGEWATER,
Plaintiff,
v.
ROGER TONNA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C-10-4966 MMC

**ORDER CONTINUING HEARING ON
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
ADJUDICATION AND MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO AMEND; DIRECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFF**

On January 7, 2011, plaintiff Sharon Bridgewater filed a motion for summary adjudication, which motion is presently scheduled for hearing on March 4, 2011. Also, on January 7, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to amend her complaint, which motion, as amended by plaintiff on January 24, 2011, is presently scheduled for hearing on March 4, 2011.

On February 14, 2011, plaintiff amended her motion for summary adjudication, which motion, as amended, is based on evidence not offered in support of the initial motion. Further, on February 14, 2011, and, again, on February 15, 2011, plaintiff amended her motion for leave to amend, which motion, as amended, now seeks to leave to file a proposed amended complaint that includes newly-asserted claims.

In order to afford defendants sufficient time to respond to the amended motions, the Court hereby CONTINUES the hearing on the motions from March 4, 2011 to March 25,

1 2011, and sets the following briefing schedule:


2 1. Defendants' response(s) to plaintiffs' motions shall be filed no later than March 4,
3 2011.

4 2. Plaintiff's reply to defendants' response(s) shall be filed no later than March 11,
5 2011.

6 Further, plaintiff is hereby DIRECTED not to file any further amendment to either
7 her motion for summary adjudication or her motion for leave to amend unless plaintiff first
8 seeks and obtains leave of court to file an amended motion.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: February 18, 2011


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

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