

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
SAVANNAH DIVISION

FIDELITY AND DEPOSIT)
COMPANY OF MARYLAND,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

Case No. CV411-102

C.E. HALL CONSTRUCTION;)
INC., C.E. HALL DEVELOPMENT,)
LLC; CHARLES E. HALL,)
individually; ZENNIE ELIZABETH)
HALL, individually; and)
REMNANT PROPERTIES, LLC,)

Defendants.)

ORDER

The parties filed a joint motion to adjust the deadlines in the Court’s scheduling order. (Doc. 32.) They insist that because defendant C.E. Hall Construction has moved to dismiss rather than filing its answer, the scheduling deadlines set forth in the Court’s scheduling order conflict with the Court’s local rules. (*Id.*; see doc. 31 (scheduling order).) There is no such conflict. The local rules deadlines control only in the absence of a scheduling order. See S.D. Ga. LR 26.1(d) (“Unless otherwise stated in the Scheduling Order. . .”). Moreover, the parties’

proposed scheduling order sets open-ended dates for certain events that will be triggered by C.E. Hall Construction's filing of an answer. (Doc. 32-1 at 1-2.) The Court disfavors such open-ended deadlines. *See e.g., Gordon v. Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc.*, No. CV410-228, doc. 3 at 2 n.1 (S.D. Ga. entered Dec. 29, 2010). Hence, the parties' joint motion to amend the scheduling order (doc. 32) is **DENIED**. Should the parties require more time for discovery or motions, they shall submit a proposed amended scheduling order within 14 days of the date of this Order listing dates certain for every event.¹

SO ORDERED this 6th day of January, 2012.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

¹ Due to an oversight, the Court failed to rule on this motion in a timely manner. Consequently, it will not penalize the parties by refusing to extend any deadlines that have already elapsed under the original scheduling order, so long as the proposed extensions are reasonable.