

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

PATRICIA A. MCCOLM

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING
AUTHORITY, et al.

Defendants.

No. C 06-7378 CW (WDB)

**ORDER FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF
PLAINTIFF'S "EMERGENCY EX
PARTE REQUEST" FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME RE
DISCOVERY**

On January 14, 2009, the Court received a document entitled "EMERGENCY EX PARTE REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME RE DISCOVERY ORDER, DEPOSITION CORRECTION AND FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEARING FOR MEDICAL IMPOSSIBILITY." Among other things, plaintiff requests the Undersigned to extend the deadline for completion of discovery. That deadline was set by District Judge Wilken. The Undersigned does not have the authority to extend it. Requests to extend that deadline must be presented directly to Judge Wilken.

The Undersigned's chambers contacted defendants' counsel to determine whether she had received plaintiff's "Emergency Ex Parte Request" and, if so, how much time she would need to prepare and file a response. Defendants' counsel advised my chambers that she had not received the subject papers and knew nothing about the requests plaintiff was making. Assuming that she would receive plaintiff's papers by January 15, 2009, defendants' counsel requested to have until January 21, 2009, to file defendants' responsive papers. That request is GRANTED.

1 Chambers of the undersigned will contact the parties promptly after receiving
2 defendants' responsive papers to determine how to proceed with respect to plaintiff's
3 requests.

4 The parties are reminded that, pursuant to Local Rules, they must appropriately
5 meet and confer in good faith in order to attempt to resolve all discovery-related
6 disputes before presenting those disputes to the Court.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: January 14, 2009



WAYNE D. BRAZIE
United States Magistrate Judge

9
10 cc: parties, CW, WDB

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28