

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RUBEN DARIO GARCIA, JR.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 A. CHANDRA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:22-cv-1221 TLN CSK P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of
18 time to file objections to the court's July 6, 2026 findings and recommendations. Plaintiff seeks
19 an extension of 60 days. In support of his request, plaintiff claims he was unable to retain a copy
20 of his opposition to the motion for summary judgment due to a prison lockdown and previously
21 asked the Court to provide him with a copy of his opposition to the motion for summary
22 judgment.¹

23
24 ¹ The Court observes that plaintiff was granted three extensions of time to file his opposition to
25 the October 10, 2025 motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 75, 77, 80.) On April 6, 2026,
26 plaintiff filed his 89 page opposition, accompanied by 278 exhibits. (ECF No. 83.) Thus,
27 plaintiff had almost six months to prepare his opposition. Given these prior extensions of time, it
28 is unclear whether he would have been granted another extension of time to copy his opposition.
However, plaintiff is cautioned that he should not rely on the Court to provide him copies (or
originals) of his court filings. As plaintiff was recently informed, even litigants proceeding in
forma pauperis are required to pay \$.50 per page for photocopies of court filings. (ECF No. 90.)
In the future, plaintiff should seek an extension of time to obtain a copy of the prospective filing.

1 The Court has determined that plaintiff's original opposition, scanned into the CM/ECF
2 docket, remains on site. (ECF No. 83.) Therefore, on a one-time basis, the Clerk will be directed
3 to return the original opposition to plaintiff.

4 As for the request for 60 day extension, the Court finds that plaintiff has not shown good
5 cause for such a lengthy extension of time. Therefore, plaintiff's request for extension of time is
6 partially granted. Plaintiff's objections to the findings and recommendations shall be filed within
7 thirty days of the date of this order.

8 Moreover, the assigned district judge has standing orders that limit the number of pages
9 that may be filed in civil actions. For example, in civil actions, memoranda of points and
10 authorities are limited to 20 pages.² (Judge Nunley's standing order page 4.) Therefore, plaintiff
11 is cautioned that his objections to the findings and recommendations may not exceed 20 pages.
12 The findings and recommendations are 15 pages, and this Court does not find that plaintiff's
13 claims constitute a rare instance requiring an exception to that page limit, particularly in light of
14 the lengthy opposition already on file.

15 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

16 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 89) is partially granted.

17 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file objections to
18 the findings and recommendations (ECF No. 88). Plaintiff's objections shall not exceed twenty
19 pages.

20 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to return plaintiff's original opposition (ECF No. 83)
21 to plaintiff.

22
23 Dated: July 27, 2026

24 
25 CHI SOO KIM
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 /1/garc1221.36(2)

28 ² "Only in rare instances and for good cause shown will the Court grant an application to extend these page limitations. All requests for page limit increases must be made in writing at least fourteen (14) days prior to the filing of the motion." Id.