

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

Civil Action No. 11-cv-03072-RM-BNB

VALERIE ANNE SCHLECHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter arises on **Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** [Doc. #115, filed 08/09/2013] (the "Motion"), which is DENIED.

The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on April 8, 2013 [Doc. #90]. I ordered the plaintiff to respond to the motion on or before April 29, 2013 [Doc. #92]. The plaintiff sought [Doc. #93] and received [Doc. #95] an extension of time to until May 28, 2013.¹ On May 28, 2013, the plaintiff sought an extension of time until June 7, 2013 [Doc. #100].² I granted the second motion for an extension of time, but I stated that no further extensions would be granted [Doc. #102].

¹The plaintiff based her first motion for an extension of time on "the plethora of immaterial facts in dispute and the sheer mountain of incomplete or misdated exhibits in the Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment."

²The plaintiff sought her second extension of time because she "has labored under unusually difficult personal circumstances" including a lack of "stable housing," and she would be "unable to obtain the affidavit of her psychologist until . . . about June 6."

The plaintiff now seeks leave to file an amended response to the Motion for Summary Judgment. She states that her current response contains “a lack of specificity in her citations to the record”; she wants to make her response to the defendant’s statement of facts more concise; she did not properly address all of the defendant’s assertions of fact and would like the “opportunity to do so”; she has had “a great deal of confusion as to how one addresses or supports assertions of fact with ‘admissible evidence’ without any determination of what ‘evidence’ is admissible”; and she needs to “provide proper citations for her arguments in order to clear up some of the confusion about the legal theories she advances.”

The plaintiff is not seeking merely to “amend”her response; she is, in essence, seeking a third extension of time so that she can prepare a new response. The plaintiff had two months to prepare her response, and she has been warned that she would not receive any additional extensions. No good cause for a further extension is shown.

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion [Doc. #115] is DENIED.

Dated August 28, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge