

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

TODD SNYDER, ESQUIRE	*	
Plaintiff	*	
vs.	*	CIVIL ACTION NO. MJG-13-3595
DAVID P. WILSON, et al.	*	
Defendants	*	
*   *   *   *	*   *   *   *	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The Court has before it Defendants' Motion for an Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint [Document 11] and the materials submitted relating thereto. The Court finds that neither a response nor a hearing is necessary.

Having read the motion and attachments, the Court notes a high level of animosity between the two sides - particularly between Plaintiff Snyder and counsel for Defendants. Snyder contends that in an arbitration proceeding, counsel for Defendants obtained, and served on him, a subpoena calling for his production of documents that include privilege and work product protected information. He seeks to avoid compliance with the subpoena.

Counsel for Defendants seeks a 30-day extension of time to respond to the Complaint. Counsel for Plaintiff refuses, noting that such a request would normally be granted as a matter of

courtesy. However, due to allegedly offensive statements by an attorney representing Defendants, the consent is denied.

There will be an occasion to sort out the merits of the case in a dispassionate manner in due course.

It appears that the Complaint raises issues that will require a reasonable time for there to be an adequate response. Indeed, a response presenting and addressing all issues for early resolution would be beneficial to both sides.

So long as Plaintiff is not prejudiced by a delay in response, the extension should be granted.

For the foregoing reasons:

1. Defendants' Motion for an Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint [Document 11] is GRANTED subject to the conditions set forth herein.
2. Defendants shall not take any action to enforce the subpoena at issue without leave of this Court.<sup>1</sup>

SO ORDERED, on Monday, January 6, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Marvin J. Garbis  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court does not intend to prejudge the case or deprive Defendants of whatever rights they may have, and the Court may well grant leave for appropriate action if requested by Defendants. However, inasmuch as the instant case is being delayed, the Court finds it appropriate to insure that Plaintiff is not unduly prejudiced by the delay.