

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL FARAH,
Plaintiff,
v.
WELLS FARGO HOME MORTGAGE, et
al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-01127-MMC](#)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
AMENDED MOTION FOR EXTENSION
OF TIME TO COMPLETE DISCOVERY**

Re: Dkt. No. 90

Before the Court is plaintiff Paul Farah's "Amended Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery (FRCP 16(b)(4))," filed September 19, 2017,¹ and supplemented September 20, 2017. Defendants have not filed opposition. See Civil L.R. 6-3 (providing four-day deadline for opposition to motion to change time). The Court, having read and considered the papers filed in support thereof, finds plaintiff's motion fails.

First, as provided in Civil Local Rule 6-3, a motion to change time "must be accompanied by . . . a declaration" setting forth a variety of factors showing good cause for the relief requested. See Civil L.R. 6-3(a); (see also Order, filed 09/19/17, directing plaintiff's attention to Rule 6-3). Second, as provided in Civil Local Rule 16-2(d)(3), a motion for relief from an obligation imposed by Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil

¹ Earlier that same date, the Court denied plaintiff's "Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery."

1 Procedure must “[b]e accompanied by a proposed revised case management schedule.”
2 See Civil L.R. 16-2(d)(3).² Third, even if the Court were to disregard the lack of a
3 declaration and proposed revised case management schedule, the motion fails, as the
4 substance of plaintiff’s showing in support thereof is inadequate. In particular, plaintiff
5 fails to describe the extent of the additional discovery he seeks, nor does he explain why
6 the time then remaining between defendants’ disclosure of assertedly new facts and the
7 non-expert discovery cutoff set forth in the Court’s Pretrial Preparation Order was
8 insufficient for any such purpose.

9 Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion is hereby DENIED.

10
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: October 2, 2017


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 ² The Court also notes plaintiff has, once again, failed to provide a chambers copy
of his motion.