

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

MICHAEL C. SKAKEL	:	
Petitioner,	:	Case No. 3:07 CV 1625 (PCD)
	:	
PETER J. MURPHY,	:	AUGUST 25, 2008
Respondent.	:	

**SIXTH JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME TO COMPLY WITH COURT'S ORDER**

Pursuant to Rule 7(b) of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure for the District of Connecticut, the petitioner and the respondent, by and through their respective counsel, hereby request an extension of time of fourteen days, or until **September 12, 2008**, to file their cross motions for summary judgment in compliance with the court's order dated March 5, 2008. This is the sixth request for an extension of time by the parties with respect to the court's order to file motions for summary judgment.

The grounds for this motion are as follows:

1. After trial by jury in the Superior Court for the Judicial District of Fairfield, the petitioner was convicted of murder, in violation of General Statutes § 53a-54a. On August 29, 2002, the trial court, *Kavanewsky, J.*, sentenced the petitioner to imprisonment for a term of twenty years to life. The petitioner appealed to the Connecticut Supreme Court, which affirmed his conviction on January 24, 2006. *State v. Skakel*, 276 Conn. 633, 888 A.2d 985 (2006). The petitioner filed a petition for certification to the United States Supreme Court which was denied on November 13, 2006. *Skakel v. Connecticut*, ___ U.S. ___, 127 S.Ct. 578, 166 L.Ed.2d 428 (2006).

2. On August 25, 2005, the petitioner filed a petition for a new trial pursuant to General Statutes § 52-270 in the Superior Court for the Judicial District of Fairfield. The trial court, *Karazin, J.*, denied the petitioner's petition for a new trial on October 25, 2007. Skakel v. State, CV05-0006524-S, Judicial District of Fairfield.

3. The petitioner filed his application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 on November 5, 2007. On November 8, 2007, this court issued an order to show cause that directed the respondent to file a response by November 30, 2007.

4. On November 29, 2007, the respondent filed a motion for extension of time seeking permission to file his answer to the petitioner's habeas corpus petition by December 21, 2007. On November 30, 2007, this court granted the respondent's motion. On December 21, 2008, the respondent filed his answer.

5. On March 5, 2008, this court ordered the petitioner and the respondent to file cross-motions for summary judgment by March 31, 2008.

6. On March 11, 2008, the parties filed the first joint motion for an extension of time to file cross-motions for summary judgment by April 30, 2008, which was granted by this Court on March 12, 2008.

7. On April 15, 2008, the parties the second joint motion for an extension of time to file cross-motions for summary judgment by May 30, 2008, which was granted by this Court on April 21, 2008.

8. On May 27, 2008, the parties filed the third joint motion for an extension of time to file cross-motions for summary judgment by June 30, 2008, which was granted by this Court on May 29, 2008.

9. On June 23, 2008, the parties filed the fourth joint motion for an extension of time to file cross-motions for summary judgment by July 30, 2008, which was granted by this Court on June 24, 2008.

10. On July 23, 2008, the parties filed the fifth joint motion for an extension of time to file cross-motions for summary judgment by August 29, 2008, which was granted by this Court on July 24, 2008.

11. Counsel for the petitioner has completed an initial draft of the legal argument for the motion for summary judgment in this matter. However, additional time is needed to edit the argument section and to try to stream-line the lengthy arguments. Moreover, additional time is necessary to compile the lengthy appendix for filing.

12. Counsel for the respondent has completed approximately half of the respondent's motion for summary judgment in this case. However, in addition to representing the respondent in this case, counsel represents the respondent-commissioner in In re Claims of Racial Disparity, Case No. CV05-4000632-S, Judicial District of Tolland, a state habeas corpus case in which prisoners on death row in Connecticut are challenging the constitutionality of the manner in which the death penalty is imposed this state. Counsel for the respondent has been required to devote significant time to the discovery proceedings in that case. Counsel for the respondent assisted the preparation of a motion to compel compliance with subpoenas served on the petitioners' expert and argued that motion before the special master presiding over the case on June 23, 2008. Since that date, counsel has been engaged in efforts to compel the petitioners and their expert to comply with the discovery order issued by the special master. Because of the time required to meet his other responsibilities, counsel for the respondent believes that it will

take him until September 12, 2008, to complete the respondent's motion for summary judgment in this case.

WHEREFORE, the petitioner and the respondent jointly move this court for an extension of time of fourteen days, or until **September 12, 2008**, to file their cross-motions for summary judgment in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL C. SKAKEL

WARDEN PETER J. MURPHY

PETITIONER

RESPONDENT

By: /s/ Hope C. Seeley
HOPE C. SEELEY
Santos & Seeley, P.C.
51 Russ Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
Tel. No. (860) 249-6548
Fax No. (860) 724-5533
E-mail: hseeley@santos-seeley.net
Federal Bar No. ct 04863

By: /s/ Michael E. O'Hare
MICHAEL E. O'HARE
Supervisory Assistant State's Attorney
Office of the Chief State's Attorney
300 Corporate Place
Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067
Tel. No. (860) 258-5887
Fax No. (860) 258-5968
E-mail: michael.ohare@po.state.ct.us
Federal Bar No. ct 05318