1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		ES DISTRICT COURT PRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9		
$\begin{vmatrix} 10 \\ 11 \end{vmatrix}$	JONATHAN BIRDT,	) CASE NO. 2:10-CV-08377-RGK -JEM
12	Plaintiff,	)  EX PARTE REQUEST FOR RULING ON
13	vs.	<ul><li>PLAINTIFF'S RULE 56(F) REQUEST TO</li><li>CONTINUE DEFENDANTS MOTION</li></ul>
14	CHARLIE BECK, LEE BACA, THE LOS	) FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENTS )
15	ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT and THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY	<ul><li>Department: 850</li><li>Before: Hon. R. Gary Klausner</li></ul>
16	SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT, DOES 1 to 50,	) Location: Roybal Courthouse,
17	Defendants.	<ul><li>255 East Temple Street</li><li>Los Angeles, CA 90012</li></ul>
18		) )
19		_)
20	Because Defendants refuse to stipulate to Plaintiffs first request and and the opposition to	
21	Defendants motions would be due in less than seven days, Plaintiff respectfully requests that Court	
22	review this matter at its' earliest convenience. Plaintiff provided a copy of the request to Defense	
23	Counsel over the Weekend, but defense counsel are unwilling to grant any extension of time. The	
24	Sheriff has gone so far as to combine both of his documents in an effort to hamper Plaintiffs request	
25	for more time to address the issues raised by the motion, but this should not impede the flow of	
26	justice, and increase the work necessary by both Counsel and the Court.	
27	April 19, 2011	/a/ Ionathan W. Dirdt
28		_/s/ Jonathan W. Birdt By Plaintiff Jonathan W. Birdt
		y Hammi Johanian W. Dhut
	319030.1	