UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EDDIE RENCHER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF NEVADA, *et al*.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:11-cv-01040-RCJ-CWH

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for an Enlargement of Time (#25), filed December 27, 2011. Defendants request a 45-day extension to file a response to Plaintiff's complaint. If granted, Defendants' responsive pleading would be due no later than February 17, 2012. The extension is necessary because assigned counsel has accepted another position and, therefore, the case has to be transferred to another attorney in the office of the Nevada Attorney General.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) provides "[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires." Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). Good cause is equated with the exercise of due diligence. *Guillen v. Owens*, 2011 WL 6032861 (D.Ariz.) (citing *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)). Ordinarily, staffing changes do not satisfy the good cause standard of Rule 6. *Guillen*, 2011 WL 6032861 *2. However, because this is a first request for an extension and counsel is leaving her position with the Nevada Attorney General's office, the Court finds there is good cause for the extension. Defendants must file a response to Plaintiff's complaint on or before February 17, 2012. No further extensions of the response deadline will be considered. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for an Enlargement of Time (#25) is **granted**. Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's complaint on or before **Thursday, February 17, 2012**.

DATED this 29th day of December, 2011.

C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge