

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

**FRANCO RIBEIRO and DEANNA)
RIBEIRO, as individuals and as next)
friends 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, MAXI MILIAAN B.V., and)
DOREL INDUSTRIES, INC.,)**

Defendants.)

8:12CV204

ORDER

This matter is before the court on Defendants’ Joint Motion for Continuance and Joint Motion for Expedited Ruling ([Filing No. 550](#)). The defendants jointly request an extension of the dates set forth in the court’s December 7, 2016, Order Amending Final Progression of the Case ([Filing No. 544](#)). Plaintiffs oppose the motion. ([Filing No. 551](#)).

In the court’s December 7, 2016, Order, the court informed the parties that further motions to change deadlines “shall not be considered in the absence of a showing by counsel

of due diligence in the timely development of this case for trial and the recent development of circumstances, unanticipated prior to the filing of the motion, which require that additional time be allowed.” ([Filing No. 544 at p. 5](#)). The court finds there has been no showing of due diligence or recent exceptional developments necessitating the defendants’ requested extensions of time. Therefore, the court is not inclined to extend the dispositive motion deadline, currently set for January 23, 2017, or the trial date, set to commence the week of April 24, 2017. However, the court has no objection to the parties’ agreeing to extend the time for defendants to conclude depositions, including expert depositions. The parties are instructed to meet and confer, per Plaintiffs’ response ([Filing No. 551 at p. 7](#)), to mutually consent and jointly agree to additional time to conclude depositions. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED: Defendants’ Joint Motion for Continuance and Joint Motion for Expedited Ruling ([Filing No. 550](#)) is denied.

DATED: January 12, 2017

BY THE COURT:

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