

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
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TSVETAN TORBOV,

No. C 14-0130 RS

Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART MOTION TO
ENLARGE TIME**

v.

CENLAR AGENCY, INC.,

Defendant.

Plaintiff Tsveten Torbov moves for a 45-day extension of his time to reply to the opposition defendant filed in connection with his application for a preliminary injunction. Torbov mistakenly asserts defendants filed an “opposition motion,” violated timing rules, and set a hearing for March 6, 2014. In fact, the March 6th hearing date on Torbov’s motion for a preliminary injunction was set by the Court when granting his motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”). Defendant filed no “opposition motion.” Defendant merely filed papers opposing Torbov’s request for a preliminary injunction. Those opposition papers were timely filed as required by the order granting the TRO.

TROs must be limited in time, and there is no basis to extend the existing one for the 45 days that Torbov effectively is requesting. As set forth in the order entered on February 28, 2014, the

1 March 6th hearing date has already been vacated. In light of Torbov's representations that he had
2 not obtained a copy of defendant's opposition as of March 3, 2014, the deadline for any reply is
3 hereby extended to March 10, 2014. The application for a preliminary injunction will then be
4 submitted without oral argument. Good cause appearing, the TRO is hereby extended through
5 March 11, 2014.

6

7

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9

10 Dated: 3/4/14

11


RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28