

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

SIDNEY THEODORE SCARLETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-CV-05418-LHK

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
EXTEND TIME**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 14, 15, 16

On November 2, 2016, the Court issued an order, ECF No. 13, granting Plaintiff 21 days to amend his complaint to address the deficiencies identified in the Court's October 3, 2016 order, ECF No. 9. Later the same day, November 2, 2016, Plaintiff filed three motions: a motion to extend time to "file and serve full response" to the Court's October 3, 2016 order, ECF No. 14, a "Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under the Equal Protection Clause," ECF No. 15, and a "Motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis," ECF No. 16.


The Court's October 3, 2016, order did not require a written response. Additionally, Plaintiff's motion to extend time did not specify what deadline Plaintiff sought to extend. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion to extend time is DENIED. However, pursuant to the Court's November 2, 2016 order, Plaintiff has until November 23, 2016 to amend his complaint to address

1 the deficiencies identified in the Court's October 3, 2016 order. ECF No. 9, 13.

2 The Court shall address Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under the  
3 Equal Protection Clause and Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in a separate  
4 order after Plaintiff has filed an amended complaint or the deadline to file an amended complaint  
5 has passed.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7  
8 Dated: November 7, 2016



LUCY H. KOH  
United States District Judge