

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

1:07cv953

RYAN MCFADYEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

DUKE UNIVERSITY, et al.,
Defendants,

**Motion for Extension of time for Rule
26(f) and Local Rule 16.1 and Rule
26(f) report.**

Now Comes Defendant Linwood E. Wilson requesting Magistrate Judge Peake to reconsider her Order and to extend the time for Order 352. This case is being held in abeyance for Sixty days in order for the parties to negotiate settlement of the case. If settlement is reached then there would be no reason for discovery in these cases. Isn't this putting the cart ahead of the horse? How does the court expect the parties to continue in good faith to reach a settlement when discovery would or could interfere with those good faith negotiations?

In all due respect to your honor, I request these be extended beyond the date set by Judge Beaty in abeyance.

Respectfully submitted this the 18th day of March, 2014,

/s/Linwood E. Wilson, Pro Se

Linwood E. Wilson

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING AND SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that, pursuant to Rule 5 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and LR5.3 and LR5.4, MDNC, the foregoing pleading, motion, affidavit, notice, or other document/paper has been electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which system will automatically generate and send a Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) to the undersigned filing user and registered users of record, and that the Court's electronic records show that each party to this action is represented by at least one registered user of record (or that the party is a registered user of record), to each of whom the NEF will be transmitted.

This the 18th day of March 2014.

By: /s/ Linwood E. Wilson

Linwood E. Wilson

Pro Se