

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 KIP SIDES,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-03893-HSG

ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 156

12 Pending before the Court is “Plaintiff’s Motion for a Case Management Conference to
13 Discuss Extending Time to Reply to File Response/Reply to Docket Number 155.” Dkt. No. 156.
14 The Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion, finding no good cause shown for extending the briefing
15 schedule in this case by more than five months as Plaintiff requests. The Court **ORDERS**
16 Defendants to produce the administrative record¹ to Plaintiff on or before Friday, July 6, 2018. To
17 the extent the parties can agree on a targeted and reasonable extension justified by specific facts,
18 see Dkt. No. 156 at 3 (“The Defendants were willing to jointly stipulate more time”), the Court
19 will consider such a stipulated request.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Dated: 7/2/2018

22 

23 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
24 United States District Judge

25
26
27 ¹ The “administrative record consists of the papers the insurer had when it denied the claim.”
28 *Montour v. Hartford Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 588 F.3d 623, 632 n.4 (9th Cir. 2009).