

NOT FOR CITATION  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

1		)
2		)
3		)
4	Michael Blomquist,	) Case No.: C07-04108 JF
5	Plaintiff,	)
6	vs.	) <b>PROPOSED ORDER TO POSTPONE</b>
7	WASHINGTON MUTUAL, a Washington	) <b>MOTIONS TO DISMISS HEARING UNTIL</b>
8	corporation; KERRY K.	) <b>AUGUST 29, 2008</b>
9	KILLINGER; JOSEPH W. SAUNDERS;	)
10	COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS, INC. a	)
11	Delaware corporation; ANGELO	)
12	MOZILLO; WACHOVIA CORPORATION,	)
13	a North Carolina corporation;	)
14	KEN THOMPSON CITIGROUP, a	)
15	Delaware corporation; SANFORD	)
16	WEILL; CHARLES PRINCE; GOLDMAN	)
17	SACHS GROUP, INC., a Delaware	)
18	corporation; HENRY PAULSON;	)
19	BEAR STERNS COMPANIES, INC., a	)
20	Delaware corporation;	)
21	JAMES CAYNE; THE MCGRAW HILL	)
22	COMPANY, INC., a Delaware	)
23	corporation; HAROLD MCGRAW III;	)
24	WELLS FARGO & COMPANY, a	)
25	Delaware corporation; PATRICIA	)
26	R. CALLAHAN; HERBERT M.	)
27	SANDLER; ROCK HOLDINGS, INC., a	)
28	Delaware corporation; EXPERIAN	)
	CORPORATION, a Delaware	)
	corporation;	)
	Defendants.	)

Plaintiff, Michael Blomquist is a pro se litigant with limited financial and legal resources.

1 Per Civil L. R. 6-3, Pro se Plaintiff, Michael Blomquist  
2 filed a motion to enlarge time. Motion requested to postpone  
3 July 11, 2008 hearing date and leave to amend FAC. Plaintiff  
4 should have filed a proposed order during the June 17, 2008  
5 filing. Within plaintiff's motion to change time was a motion  
6 for leave to amend.  
7

8 Plaintiff has stated with particularity the reasons for the  
9 enlargement of time and the court recognizes the amount of work  
10 and time necessary to prepare numerous responses.

11 Plaintiff alleges that he, Goldman Sachs and Citigroup's  
12 counsel have made numerous attempts to contact others in hopes  
13 of stipulating enlarged time to respond. Plaintiff states that  
14 both Citigroup and Goldman Sachs counsel have agreed to motion  
15 to enlarge time, but do not agree to leave to amend. Plaintiff  
16 claims he did not understand instructions during the last CMC on  
17 May 30, 2008. Plaintiff is once again instructed to attach a  
18 proposed SAC to plaintiff's oppositions. Ruling for leave to  
19 amend will be decided at the motions to dismiss hearing.  
20  
21

22 Plaintiff has alleged the substantial harm that will be  
23 done to his case and his claims if he is not provided additional  
24 time to respond. Plaintiff recognizes the deficiencies in his  
25 complaint and is instructed to correct deficiencies in a  
26 proposed SAC.  
27

28 There exists one time modification in this case. Parties  
stipulated an extension of time for defendants to respond to

1 first amended complaint. Defendants were served the FAC.

2 Defendants utilized the entirety of enlarged response time  
3 and do not appear to be burdened by postponement of motion to  
4 dismiss hearing. Countrywide filed an answer to plaintiff's FAC  
5 on March 10, 2008 and then later filed motion to dismiss on June  
6 6, 2008

7  
8 **It is hereby ordered:**

9 **Postpone July 11, 2008 motions to dismiss hearing until**  
10 **August 29, 2008 at 9 a.m. in courtroom 3.**

11 **Plaintiff must file oppositions on or before July 11, 2008.**  
12 **Plaintiff's request to file SAC is denied at this time.**

13 **Plaintiff is instructed to file or attach a proposed SAC on or**  
14 **before July 11, 2008. Court will consider leave to amend during**  
15 **the August 29, 2008 hearing.**

16  
17  
18 Dated June 20, 2008

19  
20  
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 JEREMY FOGEL  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28