Dod. 61

Nahmens v. Vilsack et al

- 2. In this case, the Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Summary Judgment/Appeal of MSPB Decision (ECF No. 53), which was 25 pages long and exceeded the page limit and was later reduced to the maximum of 20 pages. Dkt. 56. The motion is based upon an Administrative Record which is over 3117 pages long including a decision by the MSPB which is 91 pages. Dkt. 28.
- 3. Pursuant to the amended scheduling order, the Defendant is authorized to file a Combined Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion by December 6, 2024. Dkt. 52. 14 days prior to the filing of this motion is Friday, November 22, 2024.
- 4. Because of the length of the record and the number of matters being addressed, and because the Defendant will respond to all the plaintiff's arguments and make a counter motion for summary judgment in one combined document, good cause exists to allow the Defendant to exceed the page limits. The undersigned will endeavor to make the document as concise as possible, but in an abundance of caution, requests an additional 5 pages.

For these reasons, the Defendant requests that the page limit be set at 25 pages exclusive of any tables.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 20, 2024 PHILLIP A. TALBERT LINITED STATES ATTO

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

/s/Jeffrey J. Lodge JEFFREY J. LODGE Assistant United States Attorney Attorneys for the United States

## **ORDER**

The Defendant is authorized to file a Combined Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion which is up to 25 pages long.

DATED: November 21, 2024

Troy L. Nunley

Chief United States District Judge