

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  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

MICHAEL HALFORD,		
	Plaintiff,	
v.		
HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP, INC., et al.,	Defendants.	

Case No. 2:15-cv-00716-JAD-PAL

ORDER

(Mot Ext Time – Dkt. #25)

Before the court is Hartford’s Motion to Extend Time to Respond to First Amended Complaint by 14 Days (Dkt. #25). The court has considered the motion and Plaintiff’s Opposition (Dkt. #26).

Hartford requests a 14-day extension of time to file a responsive pleading to the first amended complaint which was filed August 20, 2015. The motion to extend was filed September 2, 2015, before the September 7, 105 deadline for filing a responsive pleading. Counsel for Hartford requested a 14-day extension of time from opposing counsel who declined to stipulate. The 14-day extension was requested to give counsel for Hartford sufficient time to “synthesize the allegations, facts, arguments and evidence” to support a motion to dismiss the extra-contractual claims, and a motion for summary judgment concerning the breach of contract claim and extra-contractual claims.

Plaintiff opposes the motion asserting that after the August 10, 2015 hearing on the motion to dismiss the original complaint, Plaintiff timely filed an amended complaint to address the court’s concerns. Hartford has been in possession of the set of facts Plaintiff has been alleging since before the August 10, 2015 hearing which was set out in Plaintiff’s opposition to Defendant’s motion to dismiss the original complaint. Under these circumstances, Plaintiff

1 argues good cause for a 14-day extension does not exist. Plaintiff's opposition was filed  
2 September 17, 2015.

3 Hartford filed its Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #27) and Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt.  
4 #28) on September 21, 2015 before the deadline for filing a reply to the motion to extend.  
5 Plaintiff's opposition does not claim he will be prejudiced by the modest extension requested.

6 Having reviewed and considered the matter,

7 **IT IS ORDERED** that Hartford's Motion to Extend Time to Respond to First Amended  
8 Complaint by 14 Days (Dkt. #25) is **GRANTED**.

9 DATED this 22nd day of September, 2015.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PEGGY A. LEEN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE