

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

GARY MARTINOVSKY, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-00403-MMC](#)

**ORDER CONSTRUING DEFENDANTS'  
REQUEST AS MOTION TO CHANGE  
TIME PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL  
RULE 6-3; DENYING REQUEST  
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**


Re: Dkt. No. 20

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

The Court is in receipt of defendants' "Request for Continuance of Case Management Conference Pending Hearing of Dispositive Motion" (hereinafter, "Request"), filed April 7, 2016, which Request the Court hereby construes as a motion to change time. See Civil L.R. 6-1 (providing "A Court order is required for any enlargement or shortening of time that alters an event or deadline already fixed by Court order"). Said request is not, however, in compliance with this district's local rules governing such motions. See Civil L.R. 6-3(a) (setting forth requirements for motion to change time). Accordingly, the Request is hereby DENIED, without prejudice to defendants' filing a motion to change time in compliance with the applicable local rules.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 7, 2016

  
MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
United States District Judge