

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT JACOBSEN,

Plaintiff,

No. C 06-01905 JSW

v.

MATTHEW KATZER and KAMIND
ASSOCIATES, INC.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SET DEADLINE FOR
DEFENDANTS' ANSWER**

Now before the Court is Plaintiff's administrative motion to set a deadline for Defendants' answer. There is currently a motion to dismiss the second amended complaint for failure to state a claim pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and a motion to strike pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f). The filing of a Rule 12 motion extends Defendants' time to file a responsive pleading. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(4). Even motions which challenge only some of the claims in the complaint extend the time to respond to the remaining claims. *See, e.g., Finnegan v. University of Rochester Medical Center*, 180 F.R.D. 247, 249 (W.D.N.Y. 1998). Plaintiff's administrative motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 9, 2008



JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California