COMES NOW Defendants San Mateo County Sheriff's Office, Sheriff Greg Munks, Deputy Sheriffs Dennis Loubal, Defrance McLemore, and Chris Laughlin, (collectively "County Defendants") through their attorney of record, hereby respectfully request an extension of two days to reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss.

- Counsel for County Defendants have conferred with Plaintiff's counsel and Menlo Park
 Defendants' counsel and there is no opposition to this request.
- 2. On October 22, 2015, Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint alleging various claims for relief based on 42 U.S.C. 1983. (Doc. No. 1). On February 1, 2016, County Defendants timely filed the Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(4) and 12(b)(6). (Doc. No. 23). On February 2, 2016, Plaintiff filed, and the Court Granted, Plaintiff's Notice of Substitution of Counsel. (Doc. Nos. 25, 27). On February 10, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint On or Before February 14, 2016, which the Court granted. (Doc. Nos. 29, 30). On February 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Extension of Time to File the Amended Complaint. (Doc. No. 32). The Court granted this Motion, giving leave to file the Amended Complaint on or before February 19, 2016. (Doc. No. 33). On February 23, 2016, the Court issued *sua sponte* an Order ordering the amended pleadings due by February 26, 2016. (Doc. No. 34). On February 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed the Amended Complaint. (Doc. No. 35). On February 29, 2016, the Court denied the previously filed Motion to Dismiss without prejudice. (Doc. No. 36).

On February 11, 2016, County Defendants timely filed the Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (Doc. No. 37). The Court corrected the briefing schedule as to the Motions, ordering Plaintiff's Opposition due by March 25, 2016. On March 28, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to File Responses by April 1, 2016. (Doc. No. 41). The Court granted the Motion in part, ordering Plaintiff to file his Opposition by "end of the day" of March 28, 2016. (Doc. No. 42). Plaintiff filed his Response to County Defendant's Motion to Dismiss on March 28, 2016.

3. The relief requested herein is for good cause. The County Defendant is requesting the extension of time for filing the Reply because of the extensions previously granted in the briefing schedule resulting in an unforeseen conflict with County Defendant's attorney's planned time out of the

1	office.
2	4. The two-day extension in filing the Reply will not cause any undue delay in the
3	administration of this case. The hearing on the Motion to Dismiss is set for May 5, 2016.
4	5. This is the first time that County Defendant has made no other requests for extensions of
5	time in this case.
6	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, County Defendants respectfully move that the Court extend the time
7	for responding to Plaintiff's Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss to April 7, 2016.
8	
9	Dated: April 5, 2016 Respectfully submitted,
10	JOHN C. BEIERS, COUNTY COUNSEL
11	JOHN C. BEIERS, COUNT I COUNSEL
12	P
13	By: /s/ Aimee Armsby, Deputy County Counsel
14	Attorneys for Defendants SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
15	SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF S OFFICE SHERIFF GREG MUNKS DEPUTY SHERIFF DENNIS LOUBAL
16	DEPUTY SHERIFF DEFRANCE LOUBAL DEPUTY SHERIFF CHRIS LAUGHLIN
17 18	DEFOTT SHEKIT CHKIS EXTOGREN
19	<u>ORDER</u>
20	It is hereby ORDERED the County Defendants Unopposed Motion for and Extension of time for
21	responding to Plaintiff's Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss is hereby granted to April 7, 2016.
22	
23	DATED: April 5, 2016. The Honorable William &. Alsup
24	
25	
26	
27	

28