



motion for summary judgment had been filed.” (Doc. 56, at 1-2.) This statement was false. Quinn had known about the pending Rule 56 Motions since no later than January 16, 2014. We know this because an audio recording of the January 16 hearing reveals that Judge Cassady referenced those motions repeatedly. Moreover, Quinn had been reminded of those motions (and his impending briefing deadline) in the February 5 Order. Besides, Quinn could and should have checked the docket sheet well before February 13 to ascertain what motions were pending and what deadlines were approaching. For these reasons, this Court entered an Order (doc. 57) on February 17, 2014, denying Quinn’s Motion to Extend Time.

Now, Quinn submits a seven-page Motion to Reconsider. In this Motion, he complains of “unreasonable requirements” imposed by this Court, states that he “believes this Court is attempting to hold Quinn to a higher standard,” and “asks this court for a little understanding.” (Doc. 58, at 4, 5, 7.) Frankly, the Court does not understand plaintiff’s conduct. Quinn misrepresented to this Court that he first discovered the existence of the Motions for Summary Judgment on February 13, 2014, when the record conclusively proves otherwise.<sup>1</sup> He admitted that he did not read the February 5 Order (reminding him of the impending summary judgment response deadline) until “immediately prior to and during drafting” his Motion to Reconsider on February 20. (Doc. 58, at 5.) And despite being a former attorney who practiced in federal court, Quinn admittedly did not bother to look at the docket sheet for a month after he took responsibility for this case. Yet he now attempts to blame everyone else – his former lawyer, opposing counsel, Magistrate Judge Cassady, and even this Court<sup>2</sup> – for his failure to respond to

---

<sup>1</sup> On this point, Quinn objects that he “does not have any recording or transcript of the January 16, 2014 hearing to dispute any order to speak intelligently as to all the words of that hearing.” (Doc. 58, at 7.) The audio recording of that hearing is part of the court file, and is found at document 49. The Clerk’s Office is **directed** to “unrestrict” that audio file as to Quinn, so that he may access it if he so desires.

<sup>2</sup> Quinn suggests that the summary judgment briefing schedule violates Local Rule 7.2 and that his response time was somehow unfairly shortened because he was busy doing other things. He is incorrect. Both Motions for Summary Judgment were filed on January 10, 2014. The January 13 Order provided that plaintiff had until February 7, 2014, or 28 days, to respond to those Motions. Local Rule 7.2 provides that a summary judgment response is due “[w]ithin 30 days ... **or as may be otherwise ordered.**” LR 7.2(b) (emphasis added). Nothing in Local Rule 7.2 guarantees a litigant 30 days of “unencumbered” time devoid of any other case activity in which to prepare a summary judgment response.

the summary judgment motions in a timely manner. Quinn has only himself to blame for the predicament in which he has placed himself through neither good cause nor excusable neglect.

The Motion to Reconsider is **denied**, and defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment have now been taken under submission.

DONE and ORDERED this 25th day of February, 2014.

s/ WILLIAM H. STEELE  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE