

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

**FRANCO RIBEIRO, as individuals)
and as next friends and biological)
parents of Lucas Ribeiro, an infant,)
and DEANNA RIBEIRO, as)
individual and as next friend and)
biological parents of Lucas Ribeiro, an)
infant,)**

Plaintiffs,

V.

**BABY TREND, INC., a corporation,)
MARK SEDLACK, MILLENIUM)
DEVELOPMENT CORP., INDIANA)
MILLS & MANUFACTURING INC.,)
LERADO GROUP CO., LTD.,)
LERADO GROUP (HOLDING))
COMPANY, LTD., LERADO)
(ZHONG SHAN) INDUSTRIAL CO.,)
LTD., LERADO CHINA LIMITED,)
LERADO H.K. LIMITED,)
HOLMBERGS SAFETY SYSTEM)
HOLDING AB, GNOSJOGRUPPEN)
AB, HOLMBERGS CHILDSAFETY)
AB, and GNOTEC REFTELE AB,)**

Defendants.

8:12CV204

ORDER

On July 31, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a motion requesting that the Court extend its deadline to respond to Defendant Gnotec's Motion to Dismiss. ([Filing 244](#).) The motion requested that the deadline be extended and that the deadline "coordinate and match Plaintiffs' deadlines regarding jurisdictional discovery and response to the Motion to Dismiss filed by the Lerado entities (and all extensions thereto)." On August 3, 2015, by text order, the Court granted Plaintiffs motion, and ordered Plaintiffs to respond to Defendant Gnotec's Motion to Dismiss by September 18, 2015. (Filing 247.)

On August 27, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a motion requesting that the Court compel the scheduling of the jurisdictional corporate depositions of Defendants Lerado Group (Holding) Company and Lerado H.K. Limited. ([Filing 254](#).) Plaintiffs explained that the parties had been unable to schedule the depositions on their own. Plaintiffs' motion also requested that the Court extend the deadlines to conduct jurisdictional discovery and respond to the Lerado entities' Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiffs' motion did not, however, specifically mention an extension of the deadline to respond to the Motion to Dismiss filed by Gnotec. Plaintiffs' motion to compel and request for extension of deadlines remains pending before the Court.

Plaintiffs have not responded to the Motions to Dismiss filed by Gnotec and the Lerado Defendants, seemingly because their motion to compel and for extension of time is still pending. On September 28, 2015, Gnotec filed a "Notice," rather than a motion, stating that its Motion to Dismiss should be deemed submitted. ([Filing 269](#).) Plaintiffs responded to the Notice, stating that they believed their deadline in responding to Gnotec's Motion to Dismiss coordinated with their deadline to respond to the Lerado Motion to Dismiss and, given the pendency of the motion to compel and for extension of time, believed no response was necessary by the September 18, 2015 deadline.

This litigation involves multiple foreign entities and, consequently, discovery has been slow and difficult. However, Plaintiffs have been diligent in pursuing discovery and clearly want this matter to move forward at a faster pace. There is no indication that Plaintiffs have blatantly ignored Court orders or purposely hindered rulings on the Motions to Dismiss. Plaintiffs have long expressed their belief that the Lerado Defendants possess information relevant to responding to Gnotec's Motion to Dismiss. Therefore, it should come as no surprise to Gnotec that a response to its Motion to Dismiss is tied to the pace of the Lerado discovery.

To clarify the time frames and deadlines in this matter, the Court orders as follows:

1. By October 9, 2015, the parties shall confer and schedule the remaining Lerado corporate depositions. However, these depositions shall occur no later than November 30, 2015. Plaintiffs' responses to the Motions to Dismiss filed by Gnotec and the Lerado Defendants shall be filed within thirty days of

completion of the Lerado corporate depositions.

2. Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Scheduling of Jurisdictional Depositions and for Leave to Extend Deadlines ([filing 254](#)) is denied as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED September 30, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

**S/ F.A. Gossett
United States Magistrate Judge**