add four new defendants and that any adverse impact on the existing case management schedule can be alleviated by bifurcating the matter into two discovery periods and two trials, the first involving the existing defendants and the second involving the newlyadded defendants. Dkt. # 108. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time was denied because she had not shown good cause or excusable neglect for her delay in seeking to join additional defendants. Her recent submission does not remedy that problem, and the Court rejects plaintiff's proposed case management procedure as duplicative and burdensome. For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 108) is DENIED. DATED this 19th day of November, 2019. MWS Casnik United States District Judge ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION 

FOR RECONSIDERATION