

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

KENNETH FERGUSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. TDC-14-3613
)	
PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY,)	
MARYLAND, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Kenneth Ferguson submits before this Court his Motion for Extension of Time (“the Motion”) (ECF No. 62). Defendants Officer Terrance Walker and Prince George’s County, Maryland filed a response in opposition of the Motion (ECF No. 63). The Court has reviewed the Motion and applicable law. No hearing is deemed necessary. *See* Local Rule 105.6 (D. Md.). For the reasons presented below, the Court DENIES the Motion.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The Court hereby adopts the factual and procedural background laid out in the Memorandum Opinion for this case dated November 9, 2016 (ECF No. 57). On November 22, 2016, the Court granted Defendants’ Motion to Compel and for Sanctions, ordering Plaintiff to respond to Defendants’ discovery requests (ECF No. 59). On November 29, 2016, Plaintiff filed a letter with the Court requesting additional time to respond to the discovery requests, which the Court treats as a Motion to Extend (ECF Nos. 62).

DISCUSSION

The Court may, upon a showing of “good cause,” grant a party’s motion for an extension of time. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). “[G]ood cause’ means that scheduling deadlines cannot be met

despite a party's diligent efforts." *Potomac Elec. Power Co. v. Elec. Motor Supply, Inc.*, 190 F.R.D. 372, 375 (D. Md. 1999) (citation and internal quotations omitted).

Plaintiff has not provided an excuse or justification for his request other than iterating that he is "currently representing [him]self" and has "no knowledge of law procedures." (ECF No. 62). However, a plaintiff's *pro se* status, without more, does not constitute "good cause." *See, e.g., Chen v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore*, 292 F.R.D. 288, 294 (D. Md.), *aff'd*, 546 F. App'x 187 (4th Cir. 2013) (explaining that "a plaintiff's *pro se* status, neglect, inadvertence, or ignorance are impotent to show good cause"). Plaintiff was served Defendants' discovery requests on March 2, 2016 (ECF No. 58-4), and the response deadline was extended for Plaintiff from June 13, 2016 to August 19, 2016, which Plaintiff did not adhere to. He thus has had sufficient time to gather the requested information and documentation. In the absence of a showing of good cause, the Court will not extend Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendants' discovery requests. Plaintiff shall provide all responses to discovery on or before December 27, 2016.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Court DENIES the Motion.

December 20, 2016

/s/
Charles B. Day
United States Magistrate Judge

CBD/xl