

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

IRA BROWN,

Plaintiff,

v.

PHYLLIS BRUNS, ERIC ANDER,
and U.S.P.S.,

Defendants.

8:13CV318

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend. (Filing No. [8](#).) In his Motion, and when liberally construed, Plaintiff asks the court to extend the time to file an amended complaint to allow him to exhaust his administrative remedies on his Title VII claim by first seeking relief through the EEOC or NEOC. (*Id.*) As the court previously explained to Plaintiff, he was required to exhaust his administrative remedies regarding his Title VII claim “prior to filing a suit in federal court.” (Filing No. [7](#).) Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend is denied.

On the court’s own motion, Plaintiff shall have until February 21, 2014, to file an amended complaint in accordance with the court’s December 2, 2013, Memorandum and Order. To the extent Plaintiff does not wish to pursue this matter until he has exhausted his administrative remedies, he may move to voluntarily dismiss his Complaint.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Motion to Extend (filing no. [8](#)) is denied.
2. Plaintiff shall have until February 21, 2014, to amend his Complaint in accordance with the court’s December 2, 2013, Memorandum and Order.

3. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: February 21, 2014, check for amended complaint.

DATED this 22nd day of January, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf
Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.