

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

TONY CHENG,

No. C 13-02641 JSW

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SHORTEN TIME TO HEAR  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

v.

SCHLUMBERGER,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On September 5, 2013, Plaintiff filed an Amendment to his Opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss and a Motion to Shorten Time. Plaintiff asks that the Court advance the hearing date on the motion to dismiss from November 1, 2013 to October 4, 2013. The Court’s law and motion calendar on October 4, 2013 is closed. The also Court does not find good cause to advance the hearing date to give this motion to dismiss priority over other pending motions. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff’s request to shorten time.

However, as the Court advised the parties at the status conference held on August 26, 2013, if the Court determines that it can resolve the motion without a hearing, it will notify the parties in advance of the hearing date.

In his reply brief, Plaintiff raises a continued objection to “Defendant’s redundant use of the phrase ‘erroneously identified as Schlumberger Oilfield Services,” and its position that they only represent Schlumberger Limited or Schlumberger N.V. Plaintiff requests that the Court “clarify and eliminate this confusion.” As this Court has previously advised Plaintiff, it cannot provide him with legal advice.

//  
//

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1 Accordingly, the Court also DENIES Plaintiff's request to clarify Defendant's position.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: September 23, 2013

4   
JEFFREY S. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28