



1 respond to Defendants' motion, the Court finds a response unnecessary. Local Rule 230(l).

2 A declaration of counsel filed in support of the request states that defense counsel is  
3 currently preparing a reply to Plaintiffs' opposition. (ECF No. 40.) However, due to the recent  
4 press of business in other cases, he was prevented from completing and filing Defendants' reply.  
5 Counsel requests an extension of fourteen days, up to and including November 24, 2020, to  
6 complete drafting Defendants' reply and to have the draft reviewed by his supervising attorney.  
7 (Id.) It does not appear that Defendant attempted to confer with Plaintiffs before filing the  
8 request.

9 Having considered the request, the Court finds good cause to modify the briefing schedule  
10 in this matter. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). The Court further finds that Plaintiffs will not be prejudiced  
11 by the brief extension of time requested here. However, as it appears that defense counsel has  
12 previously communicated with Plaintiffs by telephone regarding Plaintiffs' requests for  
13 extensions of deadlines, the Court notes that in the future, defense counsel should also attempt to  
14 confer with Plaintiffs before filing such requests.

15 Accordingly, Defendants' request for an extension of time to file a reply in support of  
16 Defendants' motion to dismiss, (ECF No. 40), is **HEREBY GRANTED**. Defendants shall file a  
17 reply on or before **November 24, 2020**.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: November 12, 2020

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE