

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAROBERT HUGH COLE,
Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY ADAM, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 17-05691 BLF (PR)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST TO EXTEND TIME TO
FILE REPLY TO DEFENDANTS'
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO
COMPEL**

(Docket No. 38)

Plaintiff, a California inmate, filed the instant *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against medical officials at Pelican Bay State Prison (“PBSP”). The Court found cognizable Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claims based on his allegations of inadequate medical care. (Docket No. 9.) Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on June 7, 2018. (Docket No. 19.) On August 8, 2018, Plaintiff filed an opposition to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment and a motion to compel. (Docket No. 30.) On August 29, 2018, Defendants filed a reply in support of the motion for summary judgment, (Docket No. 33), and an opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to compel, (Docket No. 34).

Plaintiff has filed a request to “extend time to reply to Defendants’ opposition to

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


motion to compel.” (Docket No. 38.) Plaintiff declares that as of September 5, 2018, he had not received a copy of Defendants’ opposition to his motion to compel and therefore is unable to prepare a reply. (Docket No. 38-1 at 3.)

Having shown good faith, Plaintiff’s request is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff shall file a reply to his motion to compel **no later than September 30, 2018**. In the interest of justice, the Clerk is directed to enclose a copy of Defendants’ opposition (Docket No. 34), with a copy of this Order.

This order terminates Docket No. 38.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 17, 2018


BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge

Order Granting EOT to File Reply to Defs’ Opp. Mot.
PRO-SE\BLF\CR.17\05691Cole_eot-reply-mtc