Brian Carr 11301 NE 7th St, Apt J5 Vancouver, WA 98684 brian@brian.carr.name

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Brian P. Carr Plaintiff	Civil No. 3:08-CV-398-HA
versus The State of Oregon through Hardy Myers in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of Oregon and the City of Portland through Linda Meng in her official capacity as City Attorney of the City of Portland Defendants	Plaintiff's Declaration In Support of Motion For Extension of Time

I, Brian P. Carr, am the plaintiff in this matter, have knowledge of the facts of this matter, and make the following statements under oath and penalty of perjury.

- 1. Prior to June 3, 2008, I was not aware that the defendants were going to each submit a motion to dismiss in lieu of an answer. While it was certainly a reasonable possibility it was not such a strong likelihood as to warrant the scheduling of time to prepare a response.
- 2. I am currently employed full time and, as such, do not have an unrestricted ability to allocate my time to any particular effort. Further, I routinely allocate a proportion of my 'free' time to volunteer work. In specific, prior to June 3, 2008 I had made commitments to drive a truck picking up donations for Habitat for Humanity and to teach yoga meditation classes at Oregon State Penitentiary (O.S.P.) in Salem, OR and Sheridan Federal Correction Institute (F.C.I.) during the period when I would be preparing the response. While it is possible to decommit on these obligations, it is expected that that would have a negative impact on these causes

MtnExtnTm, 6/9/2008, 2 of 3 Carr v Oregon et al

Brian P. Carr, Pro Se

which I believe are beneficial.

- 3. Under normal circumstances, preparing a response to mulitple motions submitted cotemporaneously is not a problem as there is commonly a pool of staff who can be allocated to the effort so that concurrent time periods is a reasonable requirement. However, I do not have any staff to rely on in the preparation of a response. The requested extension of time amounts to 22 days or 11 days for responding to each motion to dismiss, but serially rather than concurrently. This is expected to be sufficient time for responding to both motions to dismiss.
- 4. The associated response to defendants motions to dismiss and this declaration will be filed with the court. Notice of this filing will be sent by e-mail to all parties by operation of the court's electronic filing system as all parties are listed for electronic notice. Parties access this filing through the court's CM/ECF System.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Oregon and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully submitted, June 9, 2008 (Portland, OR).

<u>_s/ Brian P. Carr</u> Signature of Plaintiff Brian Carr 11301 NE 7th St., Apt J5 Vancouver, WA 98684 503-545-8357

MtnExtnTm, 6/9/2008, 3 of 3

Carr v Oregon et al