Defendant's 17-page Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with Prejudice and to further respond to the Defendant's approximately 70-page request for this Court's Judicial Notice.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

- 1. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, brought this action challenging the guilt of the Defendants for the violations of the Fair Debt Collection Act and for Extortion resulting in damages: Violations have occurred in the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692, et seq. and the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. §1681, et seq. Further, this case has already been litigated pursuant to District Court Judge Thompson's ruling of ordered mediation, in which, subsequently the Defendants rescinded the default action because there was no valid indebtedness and /or money owed, thus, *collateral estoppel and res judicata*, preclude re-litigation of this same matter.
- The Plaintiff's opposition brief is currently due fourteen (14) days from the date of the Minute Order signed by Chief Judge Gloria M. Navarro on 3/6/2015.
- 3. An additional a 45-day extension of time, to and including May 4, 2015 to file the response to the Defendant's 17-page Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint with Prejudice and to further respond to the Defendant's approximately 70-page request for this Court's Judicial Notice is necessary to ensure adequate time to prepare and file the Plaintiff's response. Preparation of the brief requires the reading of the Defendant's 17-page very complex Motion and review of the extensive number of exhibits.
- 4. The Plaintiff's education from college was in the field of engineering at the Junior College level. The Plaintiff does not have any specific education beyond the Junior College level or any advanced degrees beyond that specific Junior College level. In fact, the Plaintiff has absolutely no formal legal education or any courses related to the

preparation of legal papers. Consequently, because the response by the Defendants' Motion contained approximately 90 pages of exhibits and there are substantially many case laws that the Defendants have applied as their rebuttal argument which were included in their Motion; there needs to be thorough research conducted. Further, the response to the Motion to Dismiss may have life altering consequences for the Plaintiff who is presently unemployed; i.e., the very real possibility the Pro Se Plaintiff may become "homeless."

CONCLUSION

- 5. This Pro Se Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court will recognize that the Plaintiff needs additional time to address the merits and conduct an analysis of the exhibits of the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice. FRCP - EXTENDING TIME: the court may, for good cause, extend the time.
- 6. This Pro Se Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court will grant the 45-day extension of time because the extension of time does not substantially impact upon the Defendant Corporations.
- 7. The opposing counsel has not been contacted.
- 8. I swear under penalty of perjury that the preceding is true and correct.

Respectfully Submitted:

DATED 3-13-15

Russell Todd Leff

Pro Se, Plaintiff

5004 Walbrook Lane

Las Vegas, Nevada 89148

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff shall have through and including Monday, May 11, 2015 to file his Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Complaint With Prejudice (ECF No. 3).

Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge United States District Court

DATED: 03/25/2015

24

25

26

27

28