28

## 1 2 3 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 No. C 11-02381 CW (PR) LEO ALEJANDREZ, 7 ORDER DENYING AS PREMATURE Plaintiff, 8 PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE v. 9 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' DISPOSITIVE MOTION M. KIRCHER, et al., 10 Defendants. (Docket no. 16) 11 12 Plaintiff has filed a request for an extension of time in 13 which to file his opposition to Defendants' dispositive motion. 14 Having read and considered Plaintiff's request, and good cause 15 appearing, 16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for an extension 17 of time is DENIED as premature, as Defendants have not yet filed a 18 dispositive motion. Specifically, Defendants filed an answer to 19 the complaint on December 12, 2011, and, according to the briefing 20 schedule in the Order of Service, their dispositive motion is due 21 no later than ninety (90) days from the date the answer was due. 22 Once Defendants file their dispositive motion, Plaintiff will have 23 sixty (60) days to file an opposition thereto. 24 This Order terminates Docket no. 16. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 Dated: 1/9/2012 27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE