

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

ERNEST FLAGG, as Next Friend  
of JONATHAN BOND; TARIS JACKSON,  
as Next Friend of ASHLY JACKSON; and  
BRIAN GREENE, as Next Friend of  
INDIA BOND,

Case No. 05-74253  
Hon. Gerald E. Rosen

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF DETROIT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR CASE SCHEDULE EXTENSION**

At a session of said Court, held in  
the U.S. Courthouse, Detroit, Michigan  
on October 28, 2008

PRESENT: Honorable Gerald E. Rosen  
United States District Judge

By motion filed on October 7, 2008, Plaintiffs seek a 90-day extension of the various dates set forth in the January 4, 2008 scheduling order in this case, as subsequently amended in a March 20, 2008 order. No Defendant has responded to this motion, and the record does not otherwise indicate whether they concur in or oppose the relief sought by Plaintiffs.<sup>1</sup> Having reviewed Plaintiffs' motion and the record as a

---

<sup>1</sup>Unfortunately, while Plaintiffs have filed a 19-page motion — complete with 57 numbered paragraphs and 22 accompanying exhibits — that recounts essentially the entire history of the parties' discovery efforts and disputes to date, they fail to indicate anywhere in this

whole, and being otherwise fully advised in the premises,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' October 7, 2008 motion for case schedule extension is GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court's January 4, 2008 scheduling order, as previously amended, is further AMENDED to extend the relevant deadlines by an additional *ninety (90) days*, as follows:

Preliminary Witness Lists:	1/16/2009
Discovery Cut-Off:	1/30/2009
Non-Expert Final Witness Lists:	2/13/2009
Dispositive Motions:	3/2/2009
Proposed Joint Final Pretrial Order:	6/19/2009
Final Pretrial Settlement Conference:	Thursday, 6/25/2009 at 10:00 a.m.
Trial:	July 2009

In all other respects, the January 4, 2008 scheduling order, as amended, remains in full force and effect.

Dated: October 28, 2008

s/Gerald E. Rosen  
United States District Judge

---

lengthy submission that they complied with Local Rule 7.1(a) of this District by seeking Defendants' concurrence in the relief sought in their motion. Counsel are strongly cautioned that the Court will insist upon strict compliance with this rule as a prerequisite to consideration of any future motions. In addition, Plaintiffs should take note that it is not necessary to attach the Court's opinions and orders as exhibits to their motions — the Court is quite familiar with its own rulings, and they are readily available for review on the public docket.

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on October 28, 2008, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/LaShawn R. Saulsberry  
Case Manager