

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Judge Philip A. Brimmer

Civil Action No. 10-cv-02754-PAB-MEH

GAYLE DUNN,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC K. SHINSEKI, Secretary, United States Department of Veteran Affairs,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant's Summary Judgment Motion and Motion to Continue Final Pretrial [sic] Conference [sic] [Docket No. 43]. Plaintiff contends that, in light of a December 31, 2011 order [Docket No. 42] of the magistrate judge granting a portion of plaintiff's motion to compel production and to re-open discovery [Docket No. 29], she should receive a sixteen-day extension of time to respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment.¹ Plaintiff's response was originally due on December 22, 2011. The Court previously denied plaintiff's Motion to Stay Deadline to File Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment Pending Resolution of Discovery Issues [Docket No. 33] and Renewed Motion to Stay Deadline to File Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment Pending Resolution of Discovery Issues [Docket Nos. 36, 39]. In denying plaintiff's renewed motion on December 21, 2011, the Court *sua*

¹In the present order, the Court addresses only plaintiff's request for extension of time.

sponte extended plaintiff's time to respond to the motion for summary judgment until January 4, 2012. See Docket No. 40 at 2. The Court finds that plaintiff has failed to articulate good cause for another extension. Plaintiff shall respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment on or before January 4, 2012. In the event plaintiff deems any additional discovery received after that date to be relevant to the issues raised in defendant's motion, plaintiff can seek leave to supplement her response.

For the foregoing reasons, it is

ORDERED that plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant's Summary Judgment Motion and Motion to Continue Final Pretrial [sic] Conference [sic] [Docket No. 43] is denied to the extent it seeks an extension of time to respond to defendant's summary judgment motion.

DATED January 4, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer
PHILIP A. BRIMMER
United States District Judge