

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

5 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 v.

8 MATTHEW WAYNE, et al.,

9 Defendants.  
10

Case No. 16-cv-06994-PJH

**ORDER RE ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 145

11  
12 Before the court is plaintiff's administrative motion seeking an extension of time for  
13 the briefing and hearing on defendant's motion for partial summary judgment. See Dkt.  
14 145. Defendants have filed a response to the administrative motion, and state that they  
15 do "not necessarily oppose a short enlargement of time." Dkt. 148 at 1.

16 Because plaintiff's proposed schedule would result in less than 120 days between  
17 the summary judgment hearing and the start of trial, in violation of this court's standing  
18 order on civil cases, the court disapproves of plaintiff's proposed deadlines. Accordingly,  
19 while the court GRANTS in part plaintiff's motion, it will not adopt plaintiff's proposed  
20 schedule. Instead, the schedule shall be as follows:

21 Plaintiff's MSJ opposition due: **October 20, 2022**

22 Defendants' MSJ reply due: **October 27, 2022**

23 MSJ hearing date: **November 10, 2022**

24 The current dates for the pretrial conference and for trial remain in place.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: September 2, 2022

27 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

28 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

United States District Court  
Northern District of California