

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

Oakland Division

A F ROTHSCHILD FUND,

No. C 11-02760 LB

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING EXTENSION

v.

[ECF No. 18]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,Defendant.

On August 12, 2011, the parties filed a stipulation to extend Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss from August 19, 2011 to September 26, 2011. ECF No. 18 at 2. As the parties acknowledge, this schedule does not comport with the current Civil Local Rules, which fix the deadlines for filing opposition and reply briefs. (It also does not comport with the old rules regarding the 35-day filing deadlines for motions.) The court does not find good cause for a 28-day extension and, accordingly, **DENIES** the parties' requested extension. N.D. Cal. L.R. 6-2(b) ("After receiving a stipulated request under this Rule, the Judge may grant, deny or modify the requested time change."). However, the court **EXTENDS** Plaintiff's time to file an opposition to September 6, 2011. Defendants' optional reply is due September 13, 2011.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 19, 2011



 LAUREL BEELER
 United States Magistrate Judge