

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 ROBERT A. FREDERICK, )  
4 )  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. )  
7 FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE )  
8 ASSOCIATION, et al., )  
9 Defendants. )

Case No.: 2:11-cv-00522-GMN-PAL

ORDER

10 This is a foreclosure case filed by pro se Plaintiff Robert A. Frederick, against Defendants  
11 Federal National Mortgage Association (“Fannie Mae”), Cal-Western Reconveyance Corp.  
12 (“Cal-Western”), Aurora Loan Servicing, LLC (“Aurora”), Centex Mortgage Services  
13 (“Centex”), MERSCORP, Inc. (“MERSCORP”), Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc.  
14 (MERS), and Shalom Rubanowitz, an individual.

15 On April 18, 2012, the Court entered its Order (ECF No. 18) granting Defendants’ Motion  
16 to Dismiss (ECF No. 8), and giving Plaintiff leave to amend his Complaint consistent with the  
17 Court’s Order by May 14, 2012. Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for Enlargement  
18 of Time to File First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 19), which was filed on May 8, 2012.

19 In the Court’s Order, Plaintiff was given leave to amend his Complaint solely as to three  
20 causes of action alleged in his Complaint: (1) Violations of Unfair Lending Practices – NRS  
21 598(D); (2) Conspiracy to Commit Fraud and Conversion; and (3) Conspiracy to Commit Fraud  
22 Related to the MERS System. Plaintiff was given leave to amend the first cause of action to the  
23 extent that he might allege facts supporting tolling of the statute of limitations. Plaintiff was  
24 given leave to amend the second and third causes of action to the extent that he might allege  
25 fraud with the specificity required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b).


1 In the instant motion, Plaintiff requests ninety (90) additional days, at minimum, to amend  
2 his complaint. Plaintiff states that the extension is necessary “due to new facts in evidence and  
3 the need to compile all new documents.” Plaintiff does not state the nature of the “new facts in  
4 evidence” or the “new documents,” nor does he explain how these facts and documents are  
5 necessary to amend his complaint.

6 The Court finds that Plaintiff’s stated reasons for an enlargement of time do not provide  
7 sufficient basis for a 90-day extension. However, because Plaintiff filed the instant motion in a  
8 timely manner and provided some explanation of the basis for his request, the Court finds that  
9 good cause exists for a brief extension of the deadline.

10 Accordingly, the deadline for Plaintiff to file his first amended complaint will not be  
11 extended for ninety (90) days, as requested. However, Plaintiff’s request for enlargement of time  
12 will be granted, and Plaintiff will be given leave to file his first amended complaint by **June 1,**  
13 **2012.**

14 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion for Enlargement of Time to File First  
15 Amended Complaint (ECF No. 19) is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.** Plaintiff is  
16 given leave to amend his Complaint by **June 1, 2012.**

17 **DATED** this 9th day of May, 2012.

18  
19  
20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Gloria M. Navarro  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25