

1 Robert D. Rodriguez SBN: 242396
2 **LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT D. RODRIGUEZ**
3 429 13th Street
4 Modesto, California 95354
5 (209) 596-4263 (telephone)
6 (800) 567-9316 (fax)

7
8
9
10 PRO SE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT D. RODRIGUEZ,

11 Plaintiff,
12 v.

13 BRIAN DEL BOVE, LAW OFFICE OF BRIAN
14 DEL BOVE, and unknown entity, LESLIE
15 MATTUCCI, TISH REESE, MARGARETHA M.
16 SMIT, and DOES 1 – 30, inclusive,

17 Defendants.
18
19
20

No: 3:13-CV-00925-CRB

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF ROBERT D.
RODRIGUEZ'S EX PARTE
APPLICATION REQUESTING
ORDER ENLARGING TIME TO FILE
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS
BRIAN DEL BOVE, LAW OFFICE OF
BRIAN DEL BOVE'S F.R.C.P. 12 (B) 6
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF
JURISDICTION (Civil L.R. 6-1)**

Date: Ex Parte
Time: Ex Parte
Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

21 Plaintiff ROBERT D. RODRIGUEZ'S (Hereinafter "Plaintiff") ex parte application and
22 request for order to enlarge time to file opposition to Defendants BRIAN DEL BOVE, LAW
23 OFFICE OF BRIAN DEL BOVE (Hereinafter Collectively "Defendants") Fed. Rule of Civ. P.
24 12(B) 6 Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction was presented on or about September 11,
25 2013, in courtroom 6, 17th Floor, the Hon. Charles R. Breyer presiding.

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF ROBERT D. RODRIGUEZ'S EX PARTE APPLICATION REQUESTING ORDER
ENLARGING TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS BRIAN DEL BOVE, LAW OFFICE OF BRIAN
DEL BOVE'S F.R.C.P. 12 (B) 6 MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION (Civil L.R. 6-1)

1 The ruling of the order of court is as follows:

2 The matter having been submitted and good cause appearing therefor:

3 **IT IS NOW THE ORDER OF THIS COURT** – Plaintiff ROBERT D. RODRIGUEZ'S
4 ex parte application and request for order to enlarge time to file opposition to Defendants BRIAN
5 DEL BOVE, LAW OFFICE OF BRIAN DEL BOVE'S Fed. Rule of Civ. P. 12(B) 6 Motion to
6 Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's opposition to the motion being filed
7 on September 16, 2013, defendant's reply due September 23, 2013.

9
10 DATED: September 17, 2013

