UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ABELARDO MORALEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:17-cv-10567
District Judge Laurie J. Michelson
Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

MICHAEL SHANNON MOORE, THOMAS WILSON, AMANDA RISKA, ROBERT D. MOORE, JASON GANZHORN, RICHARD MICHAEL KLIMMER, GERALD WHALEN, GLENN J. PAGE, PATRICK BURTCH, JENNY MORRIS, SHERIDAN SURVEYING, P.C., THOMAS TINKLEPAUGH, and ADAM BROOKER,

Defendants.
_____/

ORDER REGARDING MOTION PRACTICE, SETTING DEADLINES and DENYING AS MOOT DEFENDANT PAGE'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER STAYING DISCOVERY (DE 60)

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit *in pro per* on February 21, 2017. On June 13, 2017, this Court entered an order which, in part, noticed a status / scheduling conference for June 21, 2017. (DE 50.) On that date, Plaintiff appeared, as did the following defense attorneys: Brendon R. Beer (for Michael Shannon Moore and Robert D. Moore); Rhonda R. Stowers (for Ganzhorn, Klimmer, Burtch, Morris,

Tinklepaugh and Brooker); Jason A. Geissler (for Whalen); and Elizabeth R. Husa Briggs (for Page).[1] Upon consideration:

- Plaintiff is reminded that, although he represents himself, he is presumed to know and to proceed in accordance with the court rules, such as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (Fed. R. Civ. P.), the Local Rules of the Eastern District of Michigan (E.D. Mich. LR), and my own practice guidelines, the latter two of which are available on the Court's website (www.mied.uscourts.gov).

- The deadline for filing dispositive motions asserting that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted or asserting an argument based on jurisdiction or immunity is **Friday, July 21, 2017**.

- Discovery is **STAYED** until the Court has decided any such dispositive motions. Accordingly, Defendant Page's June 19, 2017 motion for protective order staying discovery (DE 60) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

- There will be no further Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 scheduling conference, and the Court excuses the parties from engaging in a Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) conference.

- Finally, from this date until the Court states otherwise, the parties must seek leave of Court before filing any motion. The procedure for seeking such leave will be as follows: **(a)** the moving party must comply with E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a) ("Seeking Concurrence in Motions and Requests."); **(b)** if concurrence is not obtained, the moving party shall file a one-page letter explaining the basis for the proposed motion, and **(c)** the opposing side(s) will have one week within which to file its own one-page response. Thereafter, I will consider the moving

[1] The non-appearance of Defendant Sheridan Surveying, P.C., will be addressed separately.

party's letter request and rule upon whether the proposed motion may be filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 22, 2017

s/Anthony P. Patti
Anthony P. Patti
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on June 22, 2017, electronically and/or by U.S. Mail.

s/Michael Williams
Case Manager for the
Honorable Anthony P. Patti