1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	ARTHUR KHAMIS, Ca	ase No. 3:17-cv-00124-MMD-CBC
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	7-ELEVEN, INC., et al.,	
12	Defendants.	
13		
14	I. SUMMARY	
15	Defendant 7-Eleven, Inc. ("7-Eleven") filed a motion for summary judgment ("7-	
16	Eleven's Motion") on August 15, 2018. (ECF No. 31.) The Court informed Plaintiff that he	
17	would have through September 7, 2018 to file a response. (ECF No. 32.) Plaintiff has not	
18	yet filed a response; however, Plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to find a local attorney	
19	on September 4, 2018 ("Plaintiff's Motion"). (ECF No. 34.) 7-Eleven responded. (ECF No.	
20	35.) For the following reasons, the Court construes Plaintiff's Motion as a motion to extend	
21	time to respond to 7-Eleven's Motion and grants Plaintiff's Motion. However, Plaintiff is	
22	advised that he is now proceeding pro se without the assistance of an attorney, and the	
23	Court will not grant further requests for extension of time to allow Plaintiff to retain an	
24	attorney.	
25	II. LEGAL STANDARD	
26	The grant or denial of an extension of time is predicated on a showing of "good	
27	cause." See Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). The sufficiency of this showing is committed to the	
28	///	

Dockets.Justia.com

discretion of the district court. See, e.g., Jenkins v. Commonwealth Land Title Insurance
 Co., 95 F.3d 791, 795 (9th Cir. 1996).

3

## III. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff first raised the issue of retaining counsel at a scheduling conference held 4 5 on March 15, 2018. (ECF No. 25.) The Court thereafter ordered Plaintiff to retain counsel or file a notice that he would be proceeding pro se by April 23, 2018. (ECF No. 28.) Plaintiff 6 7 did not comply with this order and instead requested an additional thirty days to retain counsel on June 7, 2018. (ECF No. 29.) Plaintiff then filed another request for an extension 8 9 of time to retain counsel on September 4, 2018. (ECF No. 34.) Plaintiff has not described 10 his efforts to retain counsel and does not specify how much time he needs to retain 11 counsel. Given that Plaintiff has been unable to retain counsel since at least March 15, 12 2018, and in the absence of any explanation of his efforts, the Court finds that Plaintiff is 13 proceeding with his case pro se. As such, the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's most 14 recent motion to extend time (ECF No. 34) as a motion to extend time to respond to 7-15 Eleven's Motion. So construed, Plaintiff's motion will be granted.

16

## IV. CONCLUSION

17 It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's motion to extend time (ECF No. 34) is granted
18 nunc pro tunc. Plaintiff will have through and until October 18, 2018, to respond to
19 7-Eleven's motion for summary judgment.

- 20 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's earlier motion to extend time (ECF No. 29) is
  21 denied as moot.
- 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DATED THIS 17<sup>th</sup> day of September 2018.

MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2