

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

THERESA SCHOENBART,
Plaintiff,

No. C 16-00070 WHA

v.

JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A;
CALIBER HOME LOANS, INC., U.S.
BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, as
trustee for LSF9 Master Participation Trust,

**ORDER SETTING SCHEDULE RE
MOTION TO DISMISS AND MOTION
FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Defendants.
_____ /

The parties filed a stipulation seeking to continue the hearing on defendants' pending motions due to plaintiff's counsel's scheduling conflict. The stipulation also sought to extend the deadline for all briefing by two weeks. No good cause was shown for the extension of the deadline, and plaintiff's responses were already nearly a week overdue. The parties were ordered to show cause why the extension should be granted.

Defendants filed responses stating that they simply agreed to the stipulation as a matter of professional courtesy (Dkt. Nos. 50–51). Plaintiff filed her responses to the pending motions, but did not timely respond to the order to show cause. Plaintiff's response, a day late, restated the basis for continuing the hearing and apologized for the delay in responding to the order to show cause, but included no explanation for the delay in filing her responses to defendants' motions. Plaintiff shall explain her delay in responding to the pending motions by

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

NOON ON JUNE 10. Failure to adequately respond may result in dismissal for lack of prosecution.

Meanwhile, in light of the delays and plaintiff's scheduling conflict, defendants' replies shall be due **JUNE 13**, and the hearing is hereby **CONTINUED to JULY 14 AT 8:00 A.M.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 6, 2016.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE