

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

STEVEN R. BLAIR,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DOUGLAS COUNTY, a political subdivision existing and organized in the State of Nebraska, DONALD KLEINE, in his official capacity, STUART DORNAN, in his official capacity, JAMES JANSEN, in his official capacity, LORETTA VONDRA, in her individual and official capacities, MARY S. MCKEEVER, in her individual and official capacities, and DOUGLAS COUNTY COURT ADMINISTRATORS,

Defendants.

8:11CV349

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time to Reply to Douglas County's Second Motion to Dismiss ([Filing No. 53](#)). The defendants filed their Second Motion to Dismiss Douglas County Defendants ([Filing No. 49](#)) on April 15, 2013. Absent an extension of time, the plaintiff's response is due May 9, 2013. Although the defendants' time to respond to the plaintiff's motion has not yet expired, the court determined it was necessary to address the matter prior to the current response deadlines.

The plaintiff filed a motion to extend the response deadline until September 14, 2013. The plaintiff states he intends to amend the complaint based on the court's April 1, 2013, Order ([Filing No. 48](#)) denying the defendants previous motion to dismiss ([Filing No. 34](#)). Further, the plaintiff contends, since the deadline to amend pleadings is currently June 10, 2013 ([Filing No. 38](#)) and additional claims may be added within a statutory limitations period, the current motion to dismiss may become moot.

The court must deny the plaintiff's motion for such a lengthy extension of time. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6 requires a party to show good cause for any extension of time. **See** Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). The plaintiff fails to show good cause for the extension requested. This case was initially filed on October 7, 2011. **See** [Filing No. 1](#). The plaintiff amended the complaint on November 20, 2012. **See** [Filing No. 28](#).

The court will not create a four-month delay to await a potential motion to amend the complaint. Furthermore, the defendants are entitled to a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination” of this action as it now stands. **See** Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. Judicial efficiency and the parties’ resources are better served resolving the defendants’ current motion in light of the plaintiff’s current claims. Any additional claims may be resolved on their merits when and if they are filed. Accordingly, the court will allow the plaintiff a brief extension to fully respond to the defendants’ current motion to dismiss.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The plaintiff’s Motion to Extend Time to Reply to Douglas County’s Second Motion to Dismiss ([Filing No. 53](#)) is granted in part and denied in part, as set forth herein.

2. The plaintiff shall have until **May 29, 2013**, to file a response to the Second Motion to Dismiss Douglas County Defendants ([Filing No. 49](#)).

Dated this 8th day of May, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Thomas D. Thalken
United States Magistrate Judge