

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 SANDRA L. FERGUSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 BRIAN J. WAID AND THE WAID
14 MARITAL COMMUNITY,

15 Defendants.

Case No. C17-1685RSM

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM A DEADLINE

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Deadline, filed
17 January 2, 2018, and noted for consideration on January 12, 2018. Dkt. #17. Plaintiff seeks an
18 extension of time to file a Response to Defendants' Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, Dkt.
19 #16, otherwise due January 16, 2017. *Id.* at 1; *see also* LCR 7(d).¹ Plaintiff requests the Court
20 strike the noting date for the Rule 12(c) Motion until after the parties have filed their Joint
21 Status Report. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff argues that this relief is necessary in part "so that the parties
22 can agree on the timing and order of dispositive motions and Rule 11 motions, and discuss
23 Plaintiff's proposed stay of discovery until these motions are resolved by the Court." *Id.*
24
25
26
27

28 ¹ Defendants' pending Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, brought under Rule 12(c), was filed on December 28, 2017, and noted for consideration on January 19, 2018. Dkt. #16.

ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM A DEADLINE

1 “A motion for relief from a deadline should, whenever possible, be filed sufficiently in
2 advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the deadline.” LCR
3 7(j). Parties should not assume that the motion will be granted and must comply with the
4 existing deadline unless the court orders otherwise.” *Id.*

5 The Court finds that it can rule on the instant Motion without waiting for Plaintiff’s
6 Reply brief, and that the timing of this Order is in the benefit of the parties given the imminent
7 deadline in question. The Joint Status Report has now been filed in this case. *See* Dkt. #19.
8 Thus, the relief Plaintiff is seeking has to a certain extent been rendered moot. However,
9 because Plaintiff has also indicated a need for more time to adequately research and prepare
10 responsive briefing, *see* Dkt. #19 at 34, and because she has filed the instant Motion
11 sufficiently in advance of the deadline, the Court will grant a short extension of time as stated
12 below. The Court finds that an extension of greater than one week has not been requested or
13 justified in Plaintiff’s Motion.
14

15 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
16 finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for Relief from a Deadline, Dkt. #17, is GRANTED
17 IN PART. The Response to Defendants’ pending Motion to Dismiss is now due January 22,
18 2018. The Reply brief will be due January 26, 2018. The Court directs the Clerk to renote this
19 Motion for January 26, 2018.
20
21
22

23 DATED this 12 day of January, 2018.
24

25
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
28 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE