

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

MUHAMMAD SHABAZZ
FARRAKHAN, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

NO. CV-96-076-RHW

**ORDER AMENDING
SCHEDULING ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order to Extend Due Date of Plaintiffs’ Response to Defendants’ Reply to Motion for Summary Judgment (Ct. Rec. 244). Plaintiffs request an extension of seven days to file their reply memorandum to their cross-motion for summary judgment. Defendants do not object to the extension, but do object to any potential supplemental authorities Plaintiffs may submit in addition to their memorandum. It is premature at this time to consider Defendants’ objections to Plaintiffs’ potential filings. Defendants may file a motion to strike or other objection if necessary after Plaintiffs file their reply. Because Defendants do not object to Plaintiffs’ requested extension, the Court grants this motion.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order to Extend Due Date of Plaintiffs’ Response to Defendants’ Reply to Motion for Summary Judgment (Ct. Rec. 244) is **GRANTED**.
2. Plaintiffs shall file their reply memorandum to their cross-motion for summary judgment on or before March 22, 2006.

