

1 MATTHEW A. I. UA CRUADHLAOICH
3440 Redwood Court, Unit 2
2 Castro Valley, CA 94546
3 Telephone: (415) 742-6410

4 Plaintiff Pro Se

5 MELINDA L. HAAG (CSBN132612)
United States Attorney
6 ALEX G. TSE (CSBN 152348)
Chief, Civil Division
7 JUAN D. WALKER (CSBN 208008)
8 Assistant United States Attorney

9 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
10 San Francisco, California 94102-3495
Telephone: (415) 436-6915
11 Facsimile: (415) 436-6748
12 Email: juan.walker@usdoj.gov

13 Attorneys for the Federal Defendant

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 MATTHEW A. I. UA CRUADHLAOICH,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 JOHN E. BRYSON, Secretary of
20 Commerce, of the UNITED STATES
21 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, a
22 government entity,

23 Defendant.

No. C 12-2723 JSW

**JOINTADMINISTRATIVE
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME FOR PLAINTIFF TO
RESPOND TO DEFENDANT'S
NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT;
- [PROPOSED] ORDER**

1
2 **JOINT ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PLAINTIFF**
3 **TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANT’S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS**
4 **PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT**

5 Plaintiff Matthew A.I. Ua Cruadhlaioich hereby moves for an extension of 10 calendar
6 days, until December 14, 2012, for Plaintiff to respond to Defendant’s Notice of Motion and
7 Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint (hereinafter “Motion to Dismiss”), which was filed on
8 November 20, 2012. Defendant does not oppose this administrative motion. In support, the
9 Plaintiff states as follows:

10 1. In its Motion to Dismiss, Defendant raised various procedural and substantive issues
11 in arguing for the dismissal of each of Plaintiff’s causes of action. These issues involve detailed
12 issues of law and, moreover, the motion is a critical one, requiring Plaintiff to invest a reasonable
13 amount of time in order to adequately respond to same.

14 2. Plaintiff stated in his Plaintiff’s Separate Case Management Statement (hereinafter
15 “Case Management Statement”) filed on Friday, November 30, 2012, that he intended to timely
16 respond to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff stated this in the anticipation that he would
17 be able to complete an adequate response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss over this past
18 weekend of December 1 through December 2, 2012.

19 3. Because Plaintiff is *pro se*, he must rely upon public resources, especially law
20 libraries, for most of his legal research.

21 4. Plaintiff works full-time during the week.

22 5. At the time of filing his Case Management Statement, Plaintiff, who is not an attorney
23 and does not regularly make use of legal resources, did not realize that the law libraries in his
24 area, the Bernard E. Witkin Alameda County Law Library in Hayward, California, and the
25 Bernard E. Witkin Alameda County Law Library in Oakland, California, are closed on the
26
27
28

1 weekends. Plaintiff realized after filing his Case Management Statement that he would not
2 practically be able complete his research this past weekend.

3 6. Plaintiff was not able to visit either of these law libraries on Monday, December 3,
4 2012, or today, Tuesday, December 4, 2012, due to his work obligations.

5
6 7. As the hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is scheduled for February 22, 2013,
7 and the Initial Case Management Conference in this case is scheduled for March 15, 2013, the
8 extension of time sought herein would not reasonably be expected to interfere with the overall
9 pace of progress of this case.

10 8. The parties have conferred. Defendant does not oppose the extension and has agreed
11 to jointly file this administrative motion to expedite the Court's review and consideration of
12 same.

13
14 9. For all of the above reasons, Plaintiff herein requests an extension through Friday,
15 December 14, 2012, for Plaintiff to respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, which would
16 render the response due 24 days from the date Defendant filed its Motion to Dismiss.
17 Defendant's reply would then be due 7 days after Plaintiff files his opposition.

18 Dated: December 4, 2012

19
20 _____ /s/
21 Matthew A. I. Ua Cruadhlaioich
22 Plaintiff Pro Se

23 MELINDA L. HAAG
24 United States Attorney

25 _____ /s/
26 Juan D. Walker¹
27 Attorneys for the Federal Defendant

28 _____
¹ I, Juan D. Walker, hereby attest, in accordance with the Northern District of California's Local Rule 5-1, the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the other signatory listed on this document.

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

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED. Plaintiff's opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is due on or before December 14, 2012. Defendant's reply brief is due on or before December 21, 2012.

Date: December 5, 2012



JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE