

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION (DAYTON)**

THE PASTRY PORTAL, INC.,	:	Case No. 3:23-cv-00135
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	District Judge Thomas M. Rose
	:	Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry
vs.	:	
	:	
ELIZABETH SIEFKE, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Serve Limited Discovery (Doc. No. 13) and Motion for Extension of Time (Doc. No. 40).

For good cause shown, Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time (Doc. No. 40) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint sufficient to invoke the subject-matter jurisdiction of this Court, as set forth in the Court’s prior Order (Doc. No. 39), no later than **April 5, 2024**. Pending the filing of such a complaint, Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Serve Limited Discovery is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*/s/ Caroline H. Gentry*  
Caroline H. Gentry  
United States Magistrate Judge

### Procedure on Objections

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), any party may serve and file specific, written objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with this Order. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to **SEVENTEEN** days if this Order is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Order objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Order is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within **FOURTEEN** days after being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).