Doc. 11

2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

v.

11 MARTIN O'MALLEY,

13

15

17

12 Defendant.

MARCOS L.

Plaintiff,

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Case No. 2:23-cv-01882-CDS-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 10]

Pending before the Court is an unopposed motion for extension of time for Plaintiff to file his opening brief. Docket No. 10. Plaintiff seeks a 46-day extension premised on an assertion that counsel needs more time given competing work obligations and caseload. See id. at 1-2 (noting that in the next month "staff in Counsel's office have one hundred and twenty-three (123) Plaintiff 16 briefs due"). Such an assertion lacks important detail, including which attorney is handling this matter and why that attorney cannot meet the current deadline. Moreover, that an attorney has overloaded himself is not good cause for an extension, see, e.g., Olesczuk v. Citizens One Home 20 Loans, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 153342, at *6 n.3 (D. Nev. Nov. 4, 2016) (citing Greene v. Alhambra 21 Hosp. Med. Ctr., 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 72697, at *3 (D. Nev. June 3, 2015)), which the Court has explained to the Commissioner's attorneys when they have asked for extensions based on the same 23 reasoning, see, e.g., Fenwick v. Kijakazi, No. 2:22-cv-01077-NJK, Burright v. Kijakazi, No. 2:21cv-01288-NJK, Docket No. 25 (D. Nev. Mar. 22, 2022); Ramirez v. Saul, Case No. 2:19-cv-00978-NJK, Docket No. 21 (D. Nev. Oct. 16, 2019); Gonzalez v. Berryhill, Case No. 2:18-cv-02199-26 APG-NJK, Docket No. 16 (D. Nev. Apr. 16, 2019); Betten v. Berryhill, Case No. 2:18-cv-00536-KJD-NJK, Docket No. 24 (D. Nev. Dec. 06, 2018). In short, good cause has not been shown for the extension requested.

As a one-time courtesy to counsel, however, the Court will allow an extension. 2 Accordingly, the motion to extend is **GRANTED** and the deadline for the responsive brief is **EXTENDED** to April 1, 2024. Docket No. 10.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 6, 2024

Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge