

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Ronald F. Martinez v. A. Parks

Martinez v. Parks · No. 1:21-cv-001496-KES-CDB · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Defendants’ motion for an extension of time to oppose Plaintiff’s pending motions concerning requests for admission. The court found good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) and ordered Defendants to file any opposition by January 26, 2026.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 RONALD F. MARTINEZ, Case No.: 1:21-cv-001496-KES-CDB 12
Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME 13
v. TO OPPOSE PLAINTIFF’S PENDING MOTIONS 14 A. PARKS, (Doc. 83) 15 Defendant. 16
17 Plaintiff Ronald F. Martinez is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights 18
action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. section 1983.

19 I. INTRODUCTION 20 On December 29, 2025, Plaintiff filed three motions: (1) “Plaintiff’s
Rule 36(a)(6) Motion 21 to Determine the Sufficiency of Defendants Generic, Boilerplate
Objections and Request the 22 Matters Deemed Admitted [Defendant Parks Responses to RFA
(SET ONE)];” (2) “Plaintiff’s 23 Rule 36(a)(6) Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of
Defendant’s Boilerplate Objections and 24 Order the Matters Deemed Admitted; Intentional Rule
26(e), and Rule 37(c)(2) Violations 25 [DEFENDANT LIRONES’ES RESPONSES TO RFA
(SET ONE & TWO)];” and (3) 26 “Plaintiff’s Motion for Fees and Expenses in Proving Matter
that Should Have Been Admitted,” 27 citing Rules 36(a)(6) and 37(a)(4-5), (c)(2).

(Docs. 80-82) 1 On January 8, 2026, Defendants filed a motion for extension of time within which
to 2 respond to Plaintiff’s motions concerning the requests for admissions propounded to
Defendants 3 Parks and Lirones. (Doc. 83.) 4 II. DISCUSSION 5 District courts have broad
discretion to manage discovery and to control the course of 6 litigation under Federal Rule of
Civil Procedure 16.

Hunt v. County of Orange, 672 F.3d 606, 616 7 (9th Cir. 2012). When an act must be done within
a specified time, the court may, for good cause, 8 extend the time with or without motion or notice
if the court acts, or if a request is made, before 9 the original time expires. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)

(A). 10 Defendants seek an extension from January 12, 2026,1 to January 26, 2026, within which 11 to oppose Plaintiff’s motions.

(Doc. 83 at 3-4.) Deputy Attorney General I. Vazirani declares 12 Plaintiff served a total of 80 requests for admission and that counsel requires additional time to 13 “thoroughly review and address each disputed request for admission,” a process that will require 14 significant time. (Id. at 5, ¶ 2.) Counsel notes Plaintiff’s motions were filed during the period 15 counsel was out of the office, only having returned on January 7, 2026.

(Id.) This is Defendants’ 16 first request for an extension of time and counsel declares the request is not made to harass 17 Plaintiff or to delay the litigation. (Id., ¶ 3.) 18 The Court finds good cause to grant the requested extension of time. 19 III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER 20 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that: 21 1. Defendants’ motion for an extension of time (Doc.

83) within which to oppose 22 Plaintiff’s pending motions is GRANTED; and 23 // 24 // 25 // 26 1 Although not filed with the Court until December 29, 2025, Plaintiff’s motions were served on December 19, 2025 27 (see Doc. 80 at 43; Doc. 81 at 96; Doc. 82 at 17), making any opposition due no later than January 9, 2026. See Local Rule 230(l) (“Opposition, if any, to the granting of the motion shall be served and filed by the responding party not 1 2.

Defendants SHALL file any opposition to the pending motions no later than 2 January 26, 2026. 3 | ITIS SO ORDERED. 4 Dated: _ January 9, 2026 | Ww VV KD Kr 5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28