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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
SUSAN MAE POLK, Petitioner, v.	Case No. C <u>12-5986 VC (PR)</u> ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
KIMBERLY HUGHES, Warden, <sup>1</sup> Respondent.	Document no. 90

Petitioner Susan Mae Polk, a state prisoner incarcerated at the California Institute for Women, filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 asserting numerous claims for relief. On June 5, 2014, the Court set a briefing schedule on Polk's Motion to Strike and Seal, doc. no. 63, and on Respondent Karen Hughes's renewed motion to dismiss. Polk has filed a motion for an extension of time to file her reply to the Motion to Strike and Seal and to file her opposition to Hughes's renewed motion to dismiss.

The motion is granted in part. Because the reply to the Motion to Strike should take less time and energy than Polk devoted to writing this motion and declaration, she shall be granted one additional week to file her reply instead of the two additional months she requests.

Because the opposition to the renewed motion to dismiss may take considerable time, given that Polk has asserted ninety-one claims, Polk is granted the additional time she requests to file her opposition. Her opposition is now due two months from the day Polk receives Hughes's renewed motion to dismiss.

Based on the foregoing, the Court orders as follows:

1. Polk's reply to her Motion to Dismiss is due three weeks from the date Hughes filed her opposition. Hughes opposition was filed on June 19, 2014. Plaintiff's reply is now due on July 10, 2014.

<sup>27</sup> In accordance with Habeas Rule 2(a) and Rule 25(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Clerk of the Court is directed to substitute Warden Kimberly Hughes as Respondent because 28 she is Petitioner's current custodian.

2. Polk's opposition to Hughes's renewed motion to dismiss is now due within two months from the day she receives the motion. 3. No further extensions of time shall be considered. 4. This Order terminates docket number 90. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: June 26, 2014 1-1 VINCE CHHABRIA United States District Judge 

United States District Court Northern District of California