

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOSE LUIS BARAJAS CENTENO,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF CARLSBAD, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 3:19-cv-2098-L-DEB

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S
EXTENSION REQUEST (ECF 162-1)**

Pending before the Court is the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment. On September 3, 2021, Plaintiff filed a response to Defendants’ statement of undisputed facts. (ECF 160). Plaintiff – in that filing – asked the Court to extend his deadline to file a reply in support of his summary judgment motion, from September 3, 2021 to September 15, 2021. *Id.*

The Court issued a discrepancy order and struck that filing from the docket. (ECF 161). It was improper to combine two motions (which resulted in a lack of notice to Defendants on the ex parte request). (ECF 160). Plaintiff also failed to submit the declaration required under Local Civil Rule 83.3 (and this Court’s Standing Order). (ECF 161). And he failed to submit a proposed order to the chambers’ e-file account. (ECF 161).

On September 4, 2021, Plaintiff refiled the response and extension request. (ECF 162). Yet, he failed to cure the above deficiencies. *Id.*

1 Plaintiff's counsel contends he was unable to file a reply on time because he
2 was traveling in August. (ECF 161). But there is no reason Plaintiff waited until the
3 deadline to request an extension. The Court issued the revised schedule on the cross-
4 motions for summary judgment on July 23, 2021, a week *before* his trip began. (ECFs
5 123 & 157). And he did not file his request until four days *after* he returned. (ECF
6 160).

7 Plaintiff had sufficient time to file a reply (he already filed an opposition to
8 Defendants' summary judgment motion). The Local Rules provide parties with 7 days
9 to file a reply. *See* Civ. L. R. 7.1. Even with the above travel schedule, Plaintiff has
10 now had more than that. (*See* ECF 160). He also had several prior extensions. (*See*
11 Docket). For those reasons, Plaintiff's request is denied. The Court will nevertheless
12 authorize Plaintiff to file the reply no later than **September 9, 2021**.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: September 8, 2021

15 
16 Hon. M. James Lorenz
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28