

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,
Plaintiff,
v.
DANIEL EVERETT,
Defendant.

Case No. 17-01716
Case No. 18-05879
**ORDER RE REQUEST FOR
ADDITIONAL TIME**
Re: Dkt. No. 50

Plaintiff filed an administrative motion to consider whether *State Bar of California v. Daniel Everett*, No. 4:18-cv-05879-SBA (filed on September 25, 2018) should be related to the present case (17-cv-01716-SI). The motion was filed on October 5, 2018. Dkt. No. 46. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11(b), defendant’s opposition was due no later than October 9, 2018.

Defendant has since filed two successive requests for additional time to respond to plaintiff’s motion. Dkt. Nos. 47, 50. The Court hereby GRANTS defendant’s request. Defendant is to file a response by Monday, November 26, 2018.

The Court notes that defendant has now filed for, and been granted, four requests for extensions of time in this case. Dkt. Nos. 17, 33, 47, 50.¹ Defendant is reminded that the Court

¹ This Court has remanded defendant’s case to the California State Bar Court on three separate occasions, in three separate actions. 17-CV-01716, Dkt. No. 21; 17-CV-03595, Dkt. No. 32; 18-CV-00051, Dkt. No. 11. In addition, the Ninth Circuit summarily denied defendant’s motion to stay this Court’s remand Order. 17-CV-01716, Dkt. No. 43 (“A review of the record and the opening brief indicates that the questions raised in this appeal are so insubstantial as not to require further argument.”).

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

may issue sanctions for bad faith conduct, including delaying or disrupting litigation. *See Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 45-46 (1991); *see also Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678, 689 n.14 (1978).

The Court is not inclined to grant any additional requests.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 21, 2018



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge