

1 g
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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY SMITH
(CDCR # AC 8729),

No. C 13-206 SI (pr)

ORDER EXTENDING DEADLINES

Petitioner,

v.

RANDY GROUNDS, Warden,


Respondent.

Respondent has filed a motion to dismiss. Before respondent even filed the motion on October 30, 2013, petitioner filed a request for a 90-day extension to respond to that motion to dismiss. The amount of time requested is excessive in light of the straightforward nature of respondent's motion, but the court will grant a more limited extension of the deadline, so that petitioner has more than two months to prepare his opposition. Petitioner's request for an extension of the deadline is GRANTED. (Docket # 16.) On or before **January 17, 2014**, petitioner must file and serve his opposition to the motion to dismiss. On or before **January 31, 2014**, respondent must file and serve his reply brief, if any.

Petitioner's motion for an oral argument on the motion to dismiss is DENIED. (Docket # 13.) The court prefers to decide *pro se* prisoner matters on the written briefs because they generally are much more effectively organized than oral presentations.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 6, 2013


SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California