

**ORDER REGARDING  
MOTIONS FOR EXTENSIONS OF TIME TO ANSWER**

The Court has seen an increasing number of unopposed motions for extensions of time to file answers in cases. These extensions often cause cases to languish on the Court's docket for months and months before ever proceeding to scheduling conference.<sup>1</sup>


The Court seeks to efficiently resolve cases and get cases to trial as soon as possible. To further this goal, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that Defendants in every case shall first use the procedure set in place by Local Rule CV-12 regarding filing an Application for Extension of Time to Answer with the Clerk's office rather than filing a Motion for Extension of Time.

**LOCAL RULE CV-12 Filing of Answers and Defenses**

An attorney may, by motion, request that the deadline be extended for a defendant to answer the complaint or file a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b). **Unless otherwise ordered by the court, where the requested extension: (1) is not opposed; and (2) is not more than thirty days and does not result in an overall extension of the defendant's deadline exceeding forty-five days, the request shall be by application to the clerk, not motion.** The application shall be acted upon with dispatch by the clerk on the court's behalf, and the deadline to answer or otherwise respond is stayed pending action by the clerk.

The Court further **ORDERS** that no additional extensions of time will be granted after a party exhausts the forty-five day deadline absent a showing of good cause.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 7th day of October, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
K. NICOLE MITCHELL  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The initial scheduling/status conference is what ultimately sets the litigation schedule and starts the case moving forward.