counsel Mr. Croteau spoke by telephone and agreed to stipulate that the Federal Defendant will have until October 19, 2015, to answer and or otherwise respond to Plaintiffs' Complaint (ECF No. 1-1). Shortly after the call, the undersigned counsel sent a draft stipulation to Plaintiff's counsel by e-mail, but did not receive authorization to electronically sign the stipulation for Mr. Croteau. Undersigned counsel has not been able to reach Plaintiff's counsel since, apparently in part due to a malfunction of telephone company facilities.

The Complaint in this action raises novel issues relating to the operation of a large and complex federal program. The Federal Defendant's response implicates factual and policy issues requiring input from various operational units within the Department of Housing and Urban Development that will be affected by this action. The Federal Defendant is diligently working to determine an appropriate response to the Complaint, but has been unable to do it within the normal time allowed for an answer. Accordingly, the Federal Defendant respectfully request, and Plaintiff does not oppose an extension of time for the Federal Defendant to answer.

Respectfully submitted this 5th day of October 2015.

DANIEL G. BOGDEN United States Attorney

/s/ Troy K. Flake
TROY K. FLAKE
Assistant United States Attorney

Attorneys for the United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: October 8, 2015

IT IS SO ORDERED: