Re: Dkt. No. 4	1		
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 DEBORAH LAGUTARIS, 7 Plaintiff, 8 v. 9 V. 9 ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO CONTINUE 10 SECURITY,	2		
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 DEBORAH LAGUTARIS, 7 District of california 8 V. 9 V. 10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Northern DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 Commissioner of social Security,	3		
6 DEBORAH LAGUTARIS, 7 Plaintiff, 8 v. 9 V. 10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, 10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Comparison of the security of the secure security of the security of the security of	4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7DEBORAH LAGUTARIS, Plaintiff,Case No. 16-cv-00301-SI8V.ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO CONTINUE9COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO CONTINUE Re: Dkt. No. 4	5	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7 Plaintiff, 8 v. 9 ORDER DENYING AS MOOT 9 Plaintiff, 10 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL 10 SECURITY, Re: Dkt. No. 4	6		
v.ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,10COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,10Re: Dkt. No. 4	7		Case No. <u>16-cv-00301-SI</u>
9 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO CONTINUE10COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,Re: Dkt. No. 4	8	N.	
10 SECURITY, Re: Dkt. No. 4	9	v.	
	10		CONTINUE
	11	Defendant.	

On January 19, 2016, plaintiff Deborah Lagutaris filed a complaint for judicial review of the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. Docket No. 1. That same day, she also filed a request to continue the deadline to file an appeal of the Social Security decision by sixty days. Docket No. 4. Because plaintiff's filing of the complaint in this case *was* the appeal of the Social Security decision, plaintiff's request for a continuance is DENIED as moot.

A procedural order was issued in this case on January 19, 2016. Docket No. 2. That order explains that, once the defendant has been served with the summons and complaint—which has not yet happened¹—the defendant has ninety days to file an answer and a copy of the administrative record. Once the defendant has filed an answer, plaintiff has thirty days to file her motion for summary judgment or remand. Thus, if defendants are served soon, plaintiff will likely not need to file anything for at least sixty days, which is the length of the extension that she has sought in order to obtain representation. Likely, plaintiff's filing will not be due until the spring, perhaps sometime in May.

United States District Court Northern District of California ¹ The Court is separately approving plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.
 See Docket No. 3. As part of that approval process, the Court is ordering that the U.S. Marshals serve the defendant, at no cost to the plaintiff.

Plaintiff therefore has time in which to find a lawyer. If the deadline for filing her motion approaches and she still needs more time to find representation, plaintiff may file a further request for an extension.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 27, 2016

airen Elston

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge

United States District Court Northern District of California