## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

CHAMBERS OF
J. FREDERICK MOTZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

101 WEST LOMBARD STREET BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201 (410) 962-0782 (410) 962-2698 FAX

March 17, 2017

MEMO TO COUNSEL RE: Franklin Savage, et al. v. Pocomoke City, et al. Civil No. JFM-16-201

Dear Counsel:

I have reviewed the memoranda submitted in connection with the motion to intervence filed by the United States of America (document 88), the motion to dismiss filed by Reggie T.

Mason et al (document 92), the motion to strike exhibit A to the second amended complaint filed by Russell Blake et al (document 93), the motion to dismiss filed by the County-Commissioners of Worcester County (document 97), the motion to dismiss filed by Pocomoke City (document 98), the motion to strike amended complaint filed by Russell Blake et al (document 100), the motion to strike the amended complaint filed by Patricia Donaldson (document 103), the motion to dismiss or for summary judgment filed by Patricia Donaldson et al (document 104), the motion to dismiss or for summary judgment filed by the State of Maryland (document 105), the motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim filed by Reggie Mason and the State of Maryland (document 124), the motion for summary judgment filed by Ernest Crofoot (document 144), and the motion for leave to file surreply filed by the United States (document 152).

The motion to intervene filed by the United States is granted. All of the other motions are denied without prejudice to the issues being re-raised by a motion for summary judgment at the conclusion of discovery.

A conference call will be held on April 3, 2017 at 4:30 p.m. to discuss the appropriate schedule in this case. I ask counsel for plaintiff to initiate the call.

Enclosed is a tentative scheduling order with approximate dates for your information. Please consult with one another before the call and be prepared to discuss whether you would like to participate in a settlement conference either before or after the completion of discovery, any changes to the dates in the form scheduling order, and whether there is unanimous consent to proceed before a U.S. Magistrate Judge for all proceedings.

Also enclosed is a letter regarding a call-in hour program for the resolution of discovery disagreements.

Despite the informal nature of this letter, it should be flagged as an opinion and docketed as an order.

Very truly yours,

J. Frederick Motz

United States District Judge