1 2 3 4 5 6 7		ES DISTRICT COURT
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	WESTERN DIVISION	
10 11 12	MARY CUMMINS <i>Plaintiff</i>) Case No. CV11 08081 DMG (MANx)
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	v. AMANDA LOLLAR aka BAT WORLD SANCTUARY an individual person, BAT WORLD SANCTUARY an unknown business entity, JOHN DOES 1-10 <i>Defendants</i>	 PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY TIME PERIODS AND ADD DEFENDANTS Date: July 24, 2012 Time 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 580 Magistrate Judge Margaret A. Nagel
19 20 21	Plaintiff responds to Defendants' opposition to Plaintiff's motion to extend discovery time periods and add defendants.	
22 23 24 25	Plaintiff is not an attorney but a pro se litigant. Defendants' attorney Stephen MacPhail wrote the scheduling order which Plaintiff signed. Plaintiff did not fully understand the nature of all of the deadlines in the order. Because Plaintiff did not get the results of a subpoena to Google, Plaintiff was forced to file a motion to compel. Because Plaintiff still has not received the results of the subpoena, Plaintiff needs mot time for discovery and to add parties. The data requested in the subpoena is the identi	
26 27 28		

of the John Doe defendants which must be added to this case. Plaintiff believes 1 Defendant Lollar is one or more of the John Does. For this reason Plaintiff filed a 2 motion to extend discovery time and add defendants. 3

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed discovery requests on Defendants February 14, 2012. Defendants were late in replying. They refused to hand over some documents promised. Plaintiff was forced to file a motion to compel. Only after Plaintiff filed the motion did Defendants turn over some of the requested discovery. Plaintiff believes Defendants did not turn over all documents requested.

Plaintiff is not an attorney but a real estate appraiser. While Plaintiff has read the court rules and regulations, she has not gone to law school. Plaintiff did not correctly interpret the deadlines in the scheduling order which Defendants' attorney wrote.

Plaintiff did make mistakes in the first set of subpoenas which were sent. Plaintiff then corrected the mistakes and had a process server re-send the subpoenas properly. This complaint is against Amanda Lollar, Bat World Sanctuary AND John Does 1-10. Plaintiff believes one or more of the John Does are Defendant Amanda Lollar. Plaintiff needs to confirm the identity to attribute the libelous and defamatory statements to Defendant Lollar. Plaintiff also believes the John Does are witnesses who are working in direct concert with Defendant Lollar. Allowing Plaintiff to extend discovery and add parties would not harm or prejudice the rights of Defendants in any way.

II. LEGAL ARGUMENT

A. Good cause for a continuance of a cut-off date to add parties or amend the complaint.

Plaintiff believes she has good cause for a continuance. Plaintiff is not an attorney but a pro se litigant. Plaintiff has been diligent in this case. In fact Plaintiff came before Judge Nagel via phone hearing and stated she needed to depose Defendant quickly

28

4

5

6

7

8

because she was a pro se and may make mistakes. Plaintiff specifically said she fears she may make a mistake with subpoenas and discovery requests and need more time to correct the mistakes. This has happened with the subpoenas. The delay is getting the results of the subpoena was also caused by Google and Defendants.

During the course of this case Defendants Lollar and John Does have posted even more libel and defamation on the Internet. Plaintiff did not know all of the user names or see all of the libelous posts until after she filed the complaint. To this day Defendant Lollar and the John Does continue to post libel about Plaintiff on the Internet.

Plaintiff would agree to modify all of the dates in the scheduling order so there is no prejudice against any party.

B. Plaintiff has established good cause for a continuance of the discovery cut-off.

Defendants' attorney Stephen MacPhail wrote the scheduling order. Plaintiff did not understand all of the cut-off dates. For instance Plaintiff thought that discovery requests must be sent out by July 3, 2012 and not received by July 3, 2012. Had Google complied with the subpoena as they promised, the data would have been received in time. Plaintiff would have added the John Doe defendants in time. Again, Plaintiff believes that some of the John Does are Defendant Lollar. The others are friends who are working in direct concert with Defendant Lollar. They are witnesses. They are not unrelated acts by unrelated persons.

III. CONCLUSION

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

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the court approves Plaintiff's motion to extend discovery and add parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Cummins, Plaintiff Dated: July 5, 2012 645 W. 9th St. #110-140 Los Angeles, CA 9001

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY TIME PERIODS AND ADD DEFENDANTS

3

1	PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL
2	(FRCivP 5 (b)) or (CCP 1013a, 2015.5) or
3	(FRAP 25 (d))
4	I am Plaintiff in pro per whose address is 645 W. 9th St. #110-140, Los Angeles,
5	California 90015-1640. I am over the age of eighteen years.
6 7	I further declare that on the date hereof I served a copy of:
8	PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY TIME PERIODS AND ADD DEFENDANTS
9	on the fellowing by placing a true convertion of enclosed in a cooled envelope
10 11	on the following by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows for collection and mailing at 645 W. 9th St. #110-140, Los Angeles, CA 90015-1640.
12	Stephen M. MacPhail
13	Bragg & Kuluva 555 S. Flower St., #600
14	Los Angeles, CA 90071
15	I also faxed a copy to Stephen M. MacPhail at (213) 612-5712.
16 17	I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct.
18	Executed this day, July 5, 2012, at Los Angeles, California
19	
20	
21	Dognootfully submitted
22	Respectfully submitted,
23	Mary Cummins, Plaintiff
24	Dated: July 5, 2012
25	645 W. 9th St. #110-140 Los Angeles, CA 90015
26	In Pro Per
27	Telephone: (310) 877-4770
28	
	PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY TIME PERIODS AND ADD DEFENDANTS 4

1	DECLARATION OF MARY CUMMINS		
2	I, Mary Cummins, hereby declare:		
3	1. If called upon to testify I could and would testify truthfully as to matters set forth		
4	herein.		
5	2. I am a real estate appraiser licensed to practice in California. I am not an attorney.		
6	3. I filed discovery requests on Defendants February 14, 2012.		
7	4. Defendants were late in sending me the documents. They forced me to file a motion		
8	to compel. Only after I filed the motion to compel did Defendants turn over two		
9	more documents. They did not turn over all documents requested.		
10 11	5. I believe one or more of the John Does is Defendant Lollar. In one response to		
12	subpoena an anonymous poster was found to indeed be Lollar.		
13	6. I believe the other John Does are friends of Lollar working in concert with her to		
14	libel and defame me.		
15	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the		
16	foregoing is true and correct.		
17	Dated this 5th day of July 2012 at Los Angeles, California		
18			
19			
20	Mary Cummins		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY TIME PERIODS AND ADD DEFENDANTS		
	5		