

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 18-1118C

(Filed September 16, 2019)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

* * * * *

FAREED SEPEHRY-FARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,


Defendant.

* * * * *

ORDER

Plaintiff’s case was dismissed on August 30, 2019, for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. *Sepehry-Fard v. United States*, No. 18-1118C, 2019 WL 4137497 (Fed. Cl. Aug. 30, 2019). On September 13, 2019, plaintiff filed a motion requesting an enlargement of the time period in which he must file a Rule 59(e) reconsideration motion or a Rule 60 motion for relief from judgment. ECF. No. 19. Plaintiff also moved to seal the exhibits attached to his filing and to stay all proceedings for health reasons. *Id.* But according to Rule 6(b)(2) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims (RCFC), “[t]he court must not extend the time to act under RCFC 52(b), 59(b), (d), and (e), and 60(b).” RCFC 6(b)(2) (emphasis added). The Federal Circuit has held that these deadlines are “firm” and “not to be altered even by the court.” *Progressive Indus., Inc. v. United States*, 888 F.3d 1248, 1255 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Accordingly, Mr. Sepehry-Fard’s motion for an enlargement of the time period for filing RCFC 59(e) and RCFC 60 motions is **DENIED**. Similarly, his motion for a stay of proceedings, which would amount to the same thing as a time extension, must also be **DENIED**. Plaintiff’s motion for leave to file under seal the letter to his physician is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


 VICTOR J. WOLSKI
 Senior Judge