

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION**

DAVID GROCHOCINSKI, not individually )  
but solely in his capacity as the Chapter 7 )  
Trustee for the bankruptcy estate of )  
CMGT, INC., )  
) )  
Plaintiff, )  
) )  
v. )  
) )  
MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP, )  
RONALD B. GIVEN and CHARLES W. )  
TRAUTNER, )  
) )  
Defendants. )

No. 06 C 5486

Judge Virginia M. Kendall

**LAWYER DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
ADDITIONAL TIME TO FILE REPLY BRIEF THAT IS  
THE SAME LENGTH AS PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE BRIEF**

Defendants Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw, LLP ("Mayer Brown") and Ronald B. Given ("Given") (collectively, the "Lawyer Defendants"), by their attorneys, hereby request additional time, until February 7, 2007, to file a Reply Brief in support of their Motion to Dismiss that is the same length as Plaintiff's Response Brief.

1. By Order dated November 27, 2006, this Court granted the Lawyer Defendants leave to file a 20-page memorandum in support of their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's complaint. The same Order permitted Plaintiff to file a 20-page memorandum in response to the Motion to Dismiss.

2. On November 30, 2006, the Lawyer Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss with a 20-page memorandum.

3. On January 5, 2007, Plaintiff filed a 26-page memorandum in response to the Motion to Dismiss. Simultaneous with the filing of this response, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file its 26-page brief -- which exceeded the length previously ordered by the Court.

4. On January 10, 2007, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion for leave to file its 26-page memorandum in response to the Motion to Dismiss.

5. Given its length, the response memorandum raises a significant number of issues that are discussed in detail. To fully and fairly reply to each of these issues, the Lawyer Defendants respectfully request leave to file a reply in support of the Motion to Dismiss that is no more than twenty-six (26) pages.

6. In addition, lead counsel for the Lawyer Defendants, Stephen Novack, has a number of commitments in other matters between now and January 24, which is the current due date for the Lawyer Defendants' reply. Those commitments include two briefs (one appellate) and an oral argument. In addition, Mr. Novack will be unable to work on the brief on January 19, 20 and 21 because of surgery scheduled for his wife on January 19. In light of the length of Plaintiff's response memorandum and Mr. Novack's commitments, the Lawyer Defendants respectfully request two additional weeks, until February 7, 2007, to file their reply in support of the Motion to Dismiss.

7. The Lawyer Defendants have not previously sought any extension of time, or any other relief, relative to this reply brief.

WHEREFORE, the Lawyer Defendants respectfully request that the Court enter an Order: (a) granting this Motion; (b) granting the Lawyer Defendants leave to file a reply brief up to twenty-six (26) pages in length; and (c) granting the Lawyer Defendants until February 7, 2007 to file their reply brief.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP AND  
RONALD GIVEN

/s/ Steven J. Ciszewski

One Of Their Attorneys

Stephen Novack  
Mitchell L. Marinello  
Steven J. Ciszewski  
Novack and Macey LLP  
100 N. Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 419-6900

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Steven J. Ciszewski, an attorney, hereby certifies that he caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Motion For Additional Time To File Reply Brief That Is The Same Length As Plaintiff's Response Brief** by electronically filing the document with the Clerk of Court using the ECF system to:

Edward T. Joyce  
Arthur W. Aufmann  
Robert D. Carroll  
EDWARD T. JOYCE & ASSOC., P.C.  
11 S. LaSalle St.  
Chicago, IL 60603

on this 16th day of January, 2007.

/s/ Steven J. Ciszewski