

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

DAVID GLENN BROWN,

Plaintiff,

No. C 12-1923 PJH

v.

**ORDER**

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Before the court is defendants' request for one additional day – August 22, 2012 – to file their reply brief in support of their motion to dismiss. They have requested this extension because they believe that plaintiff's opposition was filed one day late, on August 15, 2012. The request is GRANTED, although the court wishes to note for the record that the opposition was in fact filed on August 14, 2012, although it was not entered by the clerk until August 15, 2012.

In addition, defendants are advised that based on plaintiff's pro se status and the fact that he is not presently registered as an e-filer, they are required to file certificates of service showing service on plaintiff of each document they efile. The same rule applies to plaintiff. To date, neither side has attached a proof of service to any document it has filed with the court.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 16, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California