

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA  
NORTHWESTERN DIVISION**

Jose Doe, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 vs. )  
 )  
 Jason T. Olson, Chief of Police, Minot )  
 Police Department; Sgt. Dave Goodman, )  
 in his individual and official capacities; )  
 Detective Thompson, in her individual and )  
 official capacities; Detective Jesse Smith, )  
 in his individual and official capacities; )  
 Criminal Investigation Bureau, and )  
 an Unknown Number of Unknown Federal )  
 (ICE) and City of Minot Agents of Law )  
 Enforcement, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME; DENYING  
MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL**

Case No. 4:14-cv-119

Before the court are a “Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendant’s Motions to Dismiss, Affidavits, and Etc.” and a “Motion for Counsel or Motion for Ruling on Appeal of Appointment of Counsel; Expedited” filed by plaintiff Jose Doe.

In the motion for extension of time, plaintiff requests additional time to respond to the “Minot Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment” filed February 10, 2015. The court has reviewed the Minot defendants’ motion as well as the “Motion to Dismiss” filed by defendant Jesse Smith on February 13, 2015, and concludes that it is appropriate to suspend further briefing of the motions until after the court holds a telephonic status conference with the parties. Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion for extension of time (Docket No. 40) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff’s deadlines to respond to the Minot defendant’s motion to dismiss or for

summary judgment (Docket Nos. 31 & 39) and to defendant Jesse Smith's motion to dismiss (Docket No. 36) are extended to a date to be set during the telephone conference. The court will contact the parties to schedule the telephone conference at a later date.

To the extent plaintiff's motion for counsel requests the undersigned to reconsider the previous order denying his request for court-appointed counsel, the undersigned concludes that appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. Accordingly, the motion (Docket No. 41) is **DENIED** without prejudice. Plaintiff's appeal of the undersigned's initial order denying his request for court-appointed counsel remains pending before the district judge.

Dated this 24th day of February, 2015.

*/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.* \_\_\_\_\_  
Charles S. Miller, Jr., Magistrate Judge  
United States District Court