

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

FRED FARMAHIN FARAHANI,	)	Case No.: 12-CV-04637-LHK
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
v.	)	SECOND MOTION TO EXTEND TIME
	)	
RONALD A. FLORIA, ADOLFO SALAZAR,	)	
PLM LENDER SERVICES,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

On April 19, 2013, this Court GRANTED Defendant Floria's motion to dismiss, and gave Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint consistent with that order within 21 days, i.e., May 10, 2013. ECF No. 46.

On May 6, 2013, Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Request Extension of Time from 21 Days to 35 day as per Order of Docket #46 and Docket #50 to Amend My Motions of Malicious Abuse of Process." ECF No. 54. Plaintiff stated that he could not comply with the May 10, 2013 deadline due to his disability, and requested that the deadline be extended until May 24, 2013.

On May 8, 2013, this Court GRANTED Plaintiff's motion, but cautioned Plaintiff that by May 24, 2013, he must submit a full amended complaint (and not merely a "Motion of Malicious Abuse of Process"). ECF No. 55.


On May 16, 2013, Plaintiff filed a "Request [sic] Reasonable Time Based Upon Physical and Mental Examination Under FRCP Rule 35." ECF No. 57. This document states in relevant

1 part, “The Court also has never been aware of how my disability affects my performance in this  
2 Court, so how much of a time extension do I need to produce the documents needed for this court.  
3 This Court has the authority to exercise Fed Rule of Procedure 35to [sic] determine the amount  
4 [sic] time a disable petitioner need for extension.” *Id.* at 1.

5 The Court granted Plaintiff’s previous request for an extension of time based on Plaintiff’s  
6 own request that the deadline be extended from 21 days to 35 days. *See* ECF Nos. 54; 55. Plaintiff  
7 has not indicated any changed circumstances or new information since that previous request. The  
8 Court therefore DENIES Plaintiff’s second request for an extension of time for an unspecified  
9 period.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: May 16, 2013

12   
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 LUCY H. KOH  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28