

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 MARK MOSES,

No. C -12-05271 EDL

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION**

10 v.


11 INNOPRISE SOFTWARE, et al.,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 On April 16, 2014, the Court received a letter from Plaintiff's counsel seeking an extension
15 of time to oppose the Harris Defendants' motion for summary judgment judgement from April 15,
16 2014, to April 18, 2014. According to Plaintiff's counsel and the email attached to his letter, the
17 Harris Defendants do not oppose this request. Although Plaintiff's counsel should have e-filed this
18 request and served it on all parties pursuant to the Federal and Local Rules, the Court grants
19 Plaintiff's request and orders that Plaintiff's opposition to the Harris Defendants' motion for
20 summary judgment is due no later than April 18, 2014.¹ The Harward Defendants' and Harris
21 Defendants' replies to Plaintiff's oppositions must be filed consistent with Local Rule 7-3(c).
22 Plaintiff will not be granted any further extension of the briefing deadlines.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: April 16, 2014


ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

25
26
27
28

¹ The Court has directed the Clerk to filed Plaintiff's letter on the docket.