

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL RICHARDSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JEFFERSON SESSIONS, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-01838-JAM-AC

ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding in this matter pro se, and accordingly this motion was referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21). Defendant Xavier Becerra filed a motion to dismiss on November 27, 2017, with a hearing date set for January 24, 2018. ECF No. 8. On December 11, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion to extend the deadline for his response to January 8, 2018.<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 10 at 2. Plaintiff believes his response was due December 11, 2017. *Id.* at 1.

Pursuant to Local Rule 230(c), plaintiff's "[o]pposition, if any, to the granting of the motion shall be in writing and shall be filed and served not less than fourteen (14) days preceding the noticed (or continued) hearing date." The hearing date is January 24, 2018, making plaintiff's

///  
///

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff actually wrote January 8, 2017 is his motion, but because this date is in the past, the court interprets plaintiff's motion to mean January 8, 2018.

1 opposition due January 10, 2018. Plaintiff's motion is based on a misunderstanding regarding the  
2 due date of his opposition, and his motion (ECF No. 10) is therefore DENIED as MOOT.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: December 12, 2017

5   
6 ALLISON CLAIRE  
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28