

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT H. OCONNOR,

No. C-14-00211 DMR

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME [DOCKET NO.
35]**

v.

WELLS FARGO N.A.,

Defendant(s).

Plaintiff has filed a "Notice and Request for Extension of Time to Respond to Plaintiffs Complaint," *see* Docket No. 35, which is actually a request for an extension of time to respond to Defendant's pending motion to dismiss, *see* Docket No. 31. The court construes this as an administrative motion pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11. Wells Fargo has opposed Plaintiff's motion. [Docket No. 38.]

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) requires good cause for an extension of time under these circumstances. The court notes that Plaintiff's statement that he has discovered "additional information case rulings" [sic] is quite vague, but nonetheless grants Plaintiff's motion because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. Plaintiff shall respond to Defendant's motion to dismiss by **September 8, 2014**. Any reply shall be due on September 15, 2014. The hearing on the motion remains scheduled for September 25, 2014.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 28, 2014

DONNA M. RYU
United States Magistrate Judge