

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 JOHN CHEN,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ANDREW CAMPBELL and ANDREW  
14 HARTSTONE, INTERNAL REVENUE  
15 SERVICE,

16 Defendants.

Case No. C17-149RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO  
RESPOND

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's "Motion for an Extension of Time to  
18 Respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss." Dkt. #10. Plaintiff's one-page Motion reiterates  
19 recent action on the docket and requests a 30-day extension to respond to Defendants' Motion  
20 to Dismiss. *Id.* Plaintiff provides no further detail or argument in favor of this extension.  
21 Plaintiff failed to note the instant Motion.  
22

23 Defendants' pending Motion to Dismiss was filed on March 31, 2017, and noted for  
24 consideration on May 5, 2017. Dkt. #6. This noting date was further out than required by local  
25 rule, providing additional time for Plaintiff. *See* LCR 7(d). The deadline for a response is  
26 currently May 1, 2017. LCR 7(d)(3).  
27  
28

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND - 1

1           “A motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible, be filed sufficiently in  
2 advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the deadline.” LCR  
3 7(j). Parties should not assume that the motion will be granted and must comply with the  
4 existing deadline unless the court orders otherwise.” *Id.*

5           The Court finds that it can rule on the instant Motion without waiting for responsive  
6 briefing. Plaintiff fails to set forth any basis for granting relief from the deadline. Proceeding  
7 without an attorney is insufficient grounds for extension of deadlines without further  
8 explanation. Further, the Court notes that Plaintiff has failed to file this request in a timely  
9 fashion.  
10

11           Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby  
12 finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time to Respond (Dkt. #10) is  
13 DENIED. Any response brief to Defendants’ pending Motion to Dismiss is due no later than  
14 May 1, 2017.  
15

16           DATED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April 2017.

17  
18  
19 

20           RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
21           CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28